arXiv:1507.02013v1 [math.AP] 8 Jul 2015

Multivalued Non-Autonomous Random Dynamical Systems for Wave Equations without Uniqueness

Bixiang Wang

Department of Mathematics, New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology
Socorro, NM 87801, USA
Email: bwang@nmt.edu

Abstract

This paper deals with the multivalued non-autonomous random dynamical system generated by the non-autonomous stochastic wave equations on unbounded domains, which has a non-Lipschitz nonlinearity with critical exponent in the three dimensional case. We introduce the concept of weak upper semicontinuity of multivalued functions and use such continuity to prove the measurability of multivalued functions from a metric space to a separable Banach space. By this approach, we show the measurability of pullback attractors of the multivalued random dynamical system of the wave equations regardless of the completeness of the underlying probability space. The asymptotic compactness of solutions is proved by the method of energy equations, and the difficulty caused by the non-compactness of Sobolev embeddings on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is overcome by the uniform estimates on the tails of solutions.

Key words. Multivalued dynamical system; non-uniqueness; random attractor; critical exponent; stochastic wave equation.

MSC 2000. Primary 35B40. Secondary 35B41, 37L30.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we study the existence and measurability of random attractors of non-autonomous stochastic wave equations with critical non-Lipschitz nonlinearity on $\mathbb{R}^n$ $(1 \leq n \leq 3)$:

$$u_{tt} + \alpha u_t - \Delta u + \lambda u + f(x,u) = g(t,x) + \varepsilon u \circ \frac{dw}{dt}, \quad t > \tau, \tag{1.1}$$

with initial conditions

$$u(\tau, x) = u_0(x), \quad u_t(\tau, x) = u_1(x), \tag{1.2}$$

where α, λ and ε are positive constants, g is a non-autonomous deterministic external term in $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}, L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$, f is a nonlinear function which has critical growth rate and is not Lipschitz continuous, and w is a standard real-valued Wiener process. The symbol $\circ$ indicates that the stochastic term in (1.1) is understood in the sense of Stratonovich's integration.

The main assumption of this paper is that the nonlinearity f is continuous but not Lipschitz continuous, which leads to the non-uniqueness of solutions of (1.1)-(1.2). Consequently, the dynamical system associated with (1.1)-(1.2) becomes a multivalued (or set-valued) function. This introduces many difficulties for proving the measurability of solutions as well as the measurability of attractors because the measurability of set-valued functions are much more involved than single-valued functions. For instance, under general conditions, the measurability of attractors for stochastic equations without uniqueness still remains open in [7, 10, 12, 14, 47] when the underlying probability space is not complete. Indeed, the measurability of attractors in these cases requires either the probability space be complete [7, 10, 14, 47] or the equation satisfy a very restrictive condition [7]. In the present paper, we will solve this problem and prove an abstract result on the measurability of set-valued functions from a metric space to a separable Banach space. Then we apply the abstract result to further prove the measurability of attractors for set-valued random dynamical systems when the underlying probability space is not complete. To derive our result, we introduce the concept of weak upper semicontinuity and prove such continuity is sufficient to ensure the measurability of set-valued maps (see Definition 2.2 and Theorem 2.3). In the end, we will prove the measurability of attractors of the non-autonomous set-valued random dynamical system associated with the stochastic wave equations (1.1)-(1.2) regardless of the completeness of the underlying probability space. It is worth noticing that our approach can be applied to a wide class of stochastic equations without uniqueness, including those considered in [7, 10, 12, 14, 47].

In addition to the non-Lipschitz continuity, in this paper, the nonlinearity f is also allowed to have a growth order $\gamma = 3$ when $n = 3$, which is referred to as the critical exponent in the literature. In this case, f maps $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ as a continuous function but not compact. This introduces another difficulty for proving the asymptotic compactness of solutions. The problem caused by the critical nonlinearity will be solved by the method of energy equations, which was developed by Ball in [4] for the deterministic wave equations. Of course, for the non-autonomous stochastic equation (1.1), the energy equation is much more involved because it contains deterministic non-autonomous terms as well as random terms (see (3.13)). We will use the ergodicity of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process to deal with the random terms and then employ the energy equation (3.13) to derive the pullback asymptotic compactness of solutions in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

The equation (1.1) is defined on the whole of $\mathbb{R}^n$, which introduces extra obstacle to prove the asymptotic compactness of solutions since Sobolev embeddings are not compact on $\mathbb{R}^n$. This difficulty will be overcome by the uniform estimates on the tails of solutions as in [42, 46].

The concept of pullback attractor for autonomous stochastic equations was developed in [19, 24, 36], and then extensively studied in [1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 16, 17, 18, 19, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 31, 32, 36, 38, 43, 44]. This concept was extended to autonomous stochastic equations without uniqueness in [7, 10, 12, 13, 14], to single-valued non-autonomous random systems in [20, 45, 46], and to set-valued non-autonomous equations in [12, 47]. In the present paper, we investigate pullback attractors for the non-autonomous stochastic wave equations without uniqueness. The reader is referred to [2, 3, 4, 15, 21, 22, 23, 28, 30, 33, 34, 35, 37, 39, 40, 41] for global attractors of deterministic wave equations.

In the next section, we prove a measurability result for set-valued functions from a metric space to a separable Banach space which can be used to derive the measurability of solutions of stochastic equations without uniqueness and the measurability of pullback attractor even if the underlying probability space is not complete. In Section 3, we define a non-autonomous set-valued random dynamical system for (1.1)-(1.2), and prove the weak and strong continuity of solutions. Section 4 is devoted to the pullback asymptotic compactness of solutions which is proved by the method of energy equations. In the last section, we present the existence and uniqueness of $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractors for (1.1)-(1.2).

In the sequel, we write the norm and inner product of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ as $\|\cdot\|$ and $(\cdot,\cdot)$, respectively. The norm of a Banach space X is denoted by $\|\cdot\|_X$.

2 Multivalued non-autonomous random dynamical systems

The main purpose of this section is to prove a general measurability result for multivalued functions from a metric space to a separable Banach space. This result can be used to establish the measurability of random attractors for multivalued random dynamical systems generated by a wide class of stochastic differential equations without uniqueness, which will be demonstrated by the non-autonomous stochastic wave equations in this paper. We will also review basic concepts of multivalued non-autonomous random dynamical systems including definition and existence of random attractors, see e.g. [12, 47]. These concepts are natural extensions of single-valued non-autonomous random dynamical systems [20, 45, 46] and multivalued autonomous cocycles [7, 10, 13, 14]. The details on attractors of single-valued autonomous random dynamical systems can be found in [5, 19, 24, 36] and the references therein.

In this section, we assume X and Z are metric spaces, and their Borel σ-algebras are written as $\mathcal{B}(X)$ and $\mathcal{B}(Z)$, respectively. The collection of all subsets of Z is denoted by 2^Z. Recall that a mapping $G : X \to 2^Z$ is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{B}(X)$ if the inverse image of any open subset of Z under G is a Borel subset of X; that is, for every open set O of Z, the set $G^{-1}(O) = \{x \in X : G(x) \bigcap O \neq \emptyset\}$ belongs to $\mathcal{B}(X)$. A mapping $G : X \to 2^Z$ is said to be upper semicontinuous at $x \in X$ if for every neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of $G(x)$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $G(x') \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ whenever $d(x', x) < \delta$. An obvious sufficient criterion for upper semicontinuity of such multivalued functions is stated below.

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose X and Z are metric spaces. Let $G : X \to 2^Z$ be a multivalued function and $x_0 \in X$. If for any $x_n \to x_0$ in X and $z_n \in G(x_n)$, there exist $z_0 \in G(x_0)$ and a subsequence $\{z_{n_k}\}$ of $\{z_n\}$ such that $z_{n_k} \to z_0$ in Z, then G is upper semicontinuous at x_0.*

Proof. If G is not upper semicontinuous at x_0, then there exist a neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of $G(x_0)$, a sequence $x_n \to x_0$ and $z_n \in G(x_n)$ such that $z_n \notin \mathcal{U}$. However, by assumption, there exist $z_0 \in G(x_0)$ and a subsequence $\{z_{n_k}\}$ of $\{z_n\}$ such that $z_{n_k} \to z_0$. Since $z_0 \in G(x_0)$ and $\mathcal{U}$ is a neighborhood of $G(x_0)$, we infer that $z_{n_k} \in \mathcal{U}$ for large k, which is in contradiction with $z_{n_k} \notin \mathcal{U}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. $\square$

Based on Lemma 2.1, we introduce the following weak upper semicontinuity of multivalued functions, which will be needed in this paper when proving measurability of pullback random attractors.

Definition 2.2. Let X be a metric space and Z a Banach space. A multivalued function $G : X \to 2^Z$ is said to be weakly upper semicontinuous at $x_0 \in X$ if for any $x_n \to x_0$ in X and $z_n \in G(x_n)$, there exist $z_0 \in G(x_0)$ and a subsequence $\{z_{n_k}\}$ of $\{z_n\}$ such that $z_{n_k} \rightharpoonup z_0$ weakly in Z. If G is weakly upper semicontinuous at every $x \in X$, then we say $G : X \to 2^Z$ is weakly upper semicontinuous.

We now prove a measurability result for weakly upper semicontinuous multivalued functions.

Theorem 2.3. *Let X be a metric space and Z a separable Banach space. If $G : X \to 2^Z$ is weakly upper semicontinuous, then G is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{B}(X)$.*

Proof. Given $r > 0$ and $z_0 \in Z$, let $\overline{B} = \{z \in Z : \|z - z_0\|_Z \le r\}$ be the closed ball in Z with radius r and center z_0. Then we claim that the inverse image of $\overline{B}$ under G, $G^{-1}(\overline{B})$, is a closed subset of X. Let $x_n \in G^{-1}(\overline{B})$ and $x \in X$ such that $x_n \to x$. We will show $x \in G^{-1}(\overline{B})$. Since $x_n \in G^{-1}(\overline{B})$, we have $G(x_n) \bigcap \overline{B} \neq \emptyset$ and thus there exists $z_n \in G(x_n) \bigcap \overline{B}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $x_n \to x$ and G is weakly upper semicontinuous, we find that there exist $z \in G(x)$ and a subsequence $\{z_{n_k}\}$ of $\{z_n\}$ such that $z_{n_k} \rightharpoonup z$ in Z, which implies $z_{n_k} - z_0 \rightharpoonup z - z_0$ and thus

$$\liminf_{k \to \infty} \|z_{n_k} - z_0\|_Z \ge \|z - z_0\|_Z. \tag{2.1}$$

Since $z_{n_k} \in \overline{B}$, by (2.1) we get $\|z - z_0\|_Z \le r$ and hence $z \in \overline{B}$. On the other hand, we know $z \in G(x)$ and thus $z \in G(x) \bigcap \overline{B}$, which means $x \in G^{-1}(\overline{B})$ as desired. So we have proved that the inverse image of every closed ball in Z under G is a closed set of X.

Let $B = \{z \in Z : \|z - \widetilde{z}\|_Z < \widetilde{r}\}$ be the open ball in Z with radius $\widetilde{r}$ and center $\widetilde{z}$. Then we have $B = \bigcup\limits_{m=1}^{\infty} \overline{B}_m$ with $\overline{B}_m = \{z \in Z : \|z - \widetilde{z}\|_Z \le \widetilde{r} - \frac{1}{m}\}$ and hence

$$G^{-1}(B) = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} G^{-1}(\overline{B}_m). \tag{2.2}$$

As proved in the above, for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $G^{-1}(\overline{B}_m)$ is closed in X and thus $G^{-1}(\overline{B}_m) \in \mathcal{B}(X)$. This along with (2.2) shows that

$$G^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{B}(X) \text{ for every open ball } B \text{ in } Z. \tag{2.3}$$

Note that Z is separable and hence there exists $M = \{z_m : m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that M is dense in Z. Thus, for every open set O in Z, there exist $M_0 = \{z_{m_p} : p \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq M$ and a sequence of rational numbers $\{r_{m_p}\}_{p=1}^{\infty}$ such that $O = \bigcup\limits_{p=1}^{\infty} B_p$ where $B_p = \{z \in Z : \|z - z_{m_p}\|_Z < r_{m_p}\}$ is the open ball with radius r_{m_p} and center z_{m_p}. Therefore, $G^{-1}(O) = \bigcup\limits_{p=1}^{\infty} G^{-1}(B_p)$, which together with (2.3) implies $G^{-1}(O) \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ for every open set O in Z. $\square$

In what follows, we introduce the concept of multivalued non-autonomous cocycles (random dynamical systems). As in the single-valued case, we need to use two distinct parametric spaces, say Ω_1 and Ω_2, to deal with the non-autonomous perturbations of systems: Ω_1 is for the non-autonomous deterministic perturbation and Ω_2 for the non-autonomous stochastic perturbation. Usually, we may take Ω_1 either as the collection of all translations of deterministic external terms or as the collection of all initial times. In this paper, we will use the latter and hence take $\Omega_1 = \mathbb{R}$. However, we emphasize that all results can be carried over in an obvious way to the case when Ω_1 is the collection of translations of external terms. For stochastic perturbation, we take Ω_2 as a metric dynamical system $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \{\theta_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ where $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ is a probability space and $\theta : \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \to \Omega$ is a measure-preserving group of translations on Ω.

Again, we assume that (X, d) is a metric space and the Hausdorff semi-distance between subsets A and B is written as $d(A, B)$.

Definition 2.4. A multivalued mapping Φ: $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \times X \to 2^X$ with nonempty closed images is called a multivalued non-autonomous cocycle on X over $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \{\theta_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ if for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$ and $t, s \in \mathbb{R}^+$, the following conditions (i)-(iii) are satisfied:

(i) $\Phi(\cdot,\tau,\cdot,\cdot):\mathbb{R}^+\times\Omega\times X\to 2^X$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^+)\times\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{B}(X)$-measurable; that is, for every open set O of X, the set $\{(t,\omega,x)\in\mathbb{R}^+\times\Omega\times X:\Phi(t,\tau,\omega,x)\bigcap O\neq\emptyset\}$ belongs to $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^+)\times\mathcal{F}\times\mathcal{B}(X)$.

(ii) $\Phi(0,\tau,\omega,\cdot)$ is the identity on X;

(iii) $\Phi(t+s,\tau,\omega,\cdot)=\Phi(t,\tau+s,\theta_s\omega,\cdot)\circ\Phi(s,\tau,\omega,\cdot)$.

If there exists a positive number T such that for every $t\in\mathbb{R}^+$, $\tau\in\mathbb{R}$ and $\omega\in\Omega$,

$$\Phi(t,\tau+T,\omega,\cdot)=\Phi(t,\tau,\omega,\cdot),$$

then Φ is said to be a periodic cocycle with period T.

As mentioned earlier, it is much more difficult to obtain measurability of multivalued functions than singled-valued ones. Theorem 2.3 provides an avenue to establish the measurability of multivalued cocycles under certain conditions. More precisely, we have

Lemma 2.5. *Let Φ: $\mathbb{R}^+\times\mathbb{R}\times\Omega\times X\to 2^X$ be a multivalued function. Suppose Ω is a metric space and X a separable Banach space. If for every $\tau\in\mathbb{R}$, the mapping $\Phi(\cdot,\tau,\cdot,\cdot):\mathbb{R}^+\times\Omega\times X\to 2^X$ is weakly upper semicontinuous in the sense of Definition 2.2, then $\Phi(\cdot,\tau,\cdot,\cdot):\mathbb{R}^+\times\Omega\times X\to 2^X$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^+)\times\mathcal{B}(\Omega)\times\mathcal{B}(X)$-measurable.*

Proof. This result follows from Theorem 2.3 immediately since $\mathbb{R}^+\times\Omega\times X$ is a metric space in the present case. ☐

From now on, we assume Φ: $\mathbb{R}^+\times\mathbb{R}\times\Omega\times X\to 2^X$ is a multivalued non-autonomous cocycle on X over $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},P,\{\theta_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$.

Definition 2.6. Let $B=\{B(\tau,\omega):\tau\in\mathbb{R},\ \omega\in\Omega\}$ be a family of nonempty subsets of X. Then the Ω-limit set of B under Φ, $\Omega(B)$, is given by

$$\Omega(B)(\tau,\omega)=\bigcap_{r\geq 0}\overline{\bigcup_{t\geq r}\Phi(t,\tau-t,\theta_{-t}\omega,B(\tau-t,\theta_{-t}\omega))}$$

for every $\tau\in\mathbb{R}$ and $\omega\in\Omega$.

Definition 2.7. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a collection of families of nonempty subsets of X. Φ is said to be $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotically compact in X if for all $\tau\in\mathbb{R}$, $\omega\in\Omega$ and $D\in\mathcal{D}$, every sequence $x_n\in\Phi(t_n,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-t_n}\omega,D(\tau-t_n,\theta_{-t_n}\omega))$ has a convergent subsequence in X whenever $t_n\to\infty$.

Definition 2.8. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a collection of families of nonempty subsets of X and $\mathcal{A}=\{\mathcal{A}(\tau,\omega):\tau\in\mathbb{R},\omega\in\Omega\}\in\mathcal{D}$. Such $\mathcal{A}$ is called a $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor for Φ if the following conditions (i)-(iii) are satisfied: for every $\tau\in\mathbb{R}$ and $\omega\in\Omega$,

(i) $\mathcal{A}(\tau, \cdot) : \Omega \to 2^X$ is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{A}(\tau, \omega)$ is compact.

(ii) $\mathcal{A}$ is invariant: $\Phi(t, \tau, \omega, \mathcal{A}(\tau, \omega)) = \mathcal{A}(\tau + t, \theta_t \omega), \quad \forall\, t \geq 0$.

(iii) $\mathcal{A}$ attracts every member of $\mathcal{D}$: for every $D = \{D(\tau, \omega) : \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega\} \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} d(\Phi(t, \tau - t, \theta_{-t}\omega, D(\tau - t, \theta_{-t}\omega)), \mathcal{A}(\tau, \omega)) = 0.$$

If, in addition, there exists $T > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{A}(\tau + T, \omega) = \mathcal{A}(\tau, \omega), \quad \forall\, \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \forall\, \omega \in \Omega,$$

then $\mathcal{A}$ is said to be periodic with period T.

We remark that the $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A}$ in Definition 2.8 for a multivalued cocycle is required to be measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F}$ rather than its completion, which is the same as for single-valued cocycles. In the literature, the attractors for multivalued stochastic equations are often assumed to be measurable with respect to the completion of $\mathcal{F}$ (not $\mathcal{F}$ itself), due to the difficulty to obtain the $\mathcal{F}$-measurability. In this paper, we ill demonstrate how to employ Theorem 2.3 to establish the measurability of attractors with respect to $\mathcal{F}$.

As for single-valued cocycles, a family $K = \{K(\tau, \omega) : \tau \in \mathbb{R},\ \omega \in \Omega\} \in \mathcal{D}$ is called a $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing set for Φ if for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$ and for every $D \in \mathcal{D}$, there exists $T = T(D, \tau, \omega) > 0$ such that

$$\Phi(t, \tau - t, \theta_{-t}\omega, D(\tau - t, \theta_{-t}\omega)) \subseteq K(\tau, \omega) \quad \text{for all } t \geq T.$$

For Ω-limit sets of closed $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing sets of Φ, we have the following result which is an extension of single-valued non-autonomous cocycles and multivalued autonomous cocycles.

Lemma 2.9. *Let $\mathcal{D}$ be an inclusion-closed collection of families of nonempty subsets of X, and Φ be a multivalued non-autonomous cocycle on X over $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \{\theta_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}})$. Suppose Φ is $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotically compact in X and the mapping $\Phi(t, \tau, \omega, \cdot) : X \to 2^X$ is upper semicontinuous for each $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$. If $K \in \mathcal{D}$ is a closed $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing set of Φ, then the Ω-limit set $\Omega(K)$ has the properties: for every $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,*

(i) $\Omega(K) \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\Omega(K)(\tau, \omega)$ is compact.

(ii) $\Omega(K)$ is invariant: $\Phi(t, \tau, \omega, \Omega(K)(\tau, \omega)) = \Omega(K)(\tau + t, \theta_t \omega), \quad \forall\, t \geq 0$.

(iii) $\Omega(K)$ attracts every member of $\mathcal{D}$: for every $D \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} d(\Phi(t, \tau - t, \theta_{-t}\omega, D(\tau - t, \theta_{-t}\omega)), \Omega(K)(\tau, \omega)) = 0.$$

If, in addition, both Φ *and* K *are periodic with period* T*, then so is* $\Omega(K)$*; that is,* $\Omega(K)(\tau+T,\omega) = \Omega(K)(\tau,\omega)$ *for all* $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ *and* $\omega \in \Omega$*.*

Proof. The proof is just an obvious combination of [7] for multivalued autonomous cocycles and [45] for single-valued non-autonomous cocycles. The details will not be repeated here again. $\square$

Next, we prove the measurability of Ω-limit sets of $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing sets. To that end, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.10. *If* $E_n : \Omega \to 2^X$ *is an* $\mathcal{F}$*-measurable set-valued mapping for every* $n \in \mathbb{N}$*, then the mapping* $\omega \to \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n(\omega)$ *is* $\mathcal{F}$*-measurable, and so is the mapping* $\omega \to \overline{\bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n(\omega)}$*.*

Proof. For every open set O in X, we have

$$\left\{\omega \in \Omega : (\overline{\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n(\omega)} \bigcap O) \neq \emptyset\right\} = \left\{\omega \in \Omega : (\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n(\omega) \bigcap O) \neq \emptyset\right\}$$

$$= \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \left\{\omega \in \Omega : (E_n(\omega) \bigcap O) \neq \emptyset\right\} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n^{-1}(O). \tag{2.4}$$

By assumption, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $E_n^{-1}(O)$ is measurable for every open set O, which along with (2.4) completes the proof. $\square$

The following lemma can be found in [7] and [46].

Lemma 2.11. *Given* $n \in \mathbb{N}$*, let* $E_n : \Omega \to 2^X$ *be an* $\mathcal{F}$*-measurable set-valued mapping with nonempty closed images. Suppose for each fixed* $\omega \in \Omega$*, every sequence* $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ *with* $x_n \in E_n(\omega)$ *is precompact in* X*. If, in addition,* $\{E_n(\omega)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ *is a decreasing sequence, then the map:* $\omega \in \Omega \to \bigcap\limits_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E_n(\omega)$ *is* $\mathcal{F}$*-measurable with nonempty closed images.*

The next is a result for the $\mathcal{F}$-measurability of Ω-limit sets of absorbing sets of Φ (see also [7]).

Lemma 2.12. *Let* $\mathcal{D}$ *be an inclusion-closed collection of families of nonempty subsets of* X*, and* Φ *be a multivalued non-autonomous cocycle on* X *over* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \{\theta_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$*. Suppose* Φ *is* $\mathcal{D}$*-pullback asymptotically compact in* X *and the mapping* $\Phi(t,\tau,\omega,\cdot) : X \to 2^X$ *is upper semicontinuous for each* $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$*,* $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ *and* $\omega \in \Omega$*. If* $K \in \mathcal{D}$ *is a closed* $\mathcal{D}$*-pullback absorbing set of* Φ *and the mapping* $\omega \to \Phi(t,\tau,\omega,K(\tau,\omega))$ *is measurable with respect to* $\mathcal{F}$ *for every* $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ *and* $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$*, then the* Ω*-limit set* $\Omega(K)$ *is also measurable with respect to* $\mathcal{F}$*.*

Proof. By Definition 2.6 and Lemma 2.9, one can check that for every $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\Omega(K)(\tau, \omega) = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \overline{\bigcup_{m=n}^{\infty} \Phi(m, \tau - m, \theta_{-m}\omega, K(\tau - m, \theta_{-m}\omega))} = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n(\omega), \tag{2.5}$$

where

$$E_n(\omega) = \overline{\bigcup_{m=n}^{\infty} \Phi(m, \tau - m, \theta_{-m}\omega, K(\tau - m, \theta_{-m}\omega))}. \tag{2.6}$$

By the measurability of $\theta_{-m} : \Omega \to \Omega$ and the assumption, we find that for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\Phi(m, \tau - m, \theta_{-m}\omega, K(\tau - m, \theta_{-m}\omega))$ is measurable in ω with respect to $\mathcal{F}$, which together with (2.6) and Lemma 2.10 implies the $\mathcal{F}$-measurability of E_n.

On the other hand, since Φ is $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotically compact, we find that any sequence $x_n \in E_n(\omega)$ is precompact. It is clear that $E_n(\omega)$ is nonempty and closed and $\{E_n(\omega)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is decreasing. Therefore, by Lemma 2.11, the mapping $\omega \to \bigcap\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n(\omega)$ is measurable, which along with (2.5) completes the proof. $\square$

By Theorem 2.3 and Lemma 2.12 we obtain the following measurability of Ω-limit sets of Φ which is convenient in many applications where Φ is generated by solutions of non-autonomous stochastic equations.

Lemma 2.13. *Suppose X is a separable Banach space and Ω a metric space with $\Omega = \bigcup\limits_{m=1}^{\infty} \Omega_m$ and $\Omega_m \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be an inclusion-closed collection of families of nonempty subsets of X and Φ be a multivalued non-autonomous cocycle on X over $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}(\Omega), P, \{\theta_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$. Assume Φ is $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotically compact in X and the mapping $\Phi(t, \tau, \omega, \cdot) : X \to 2^X$ is upper semicontinuous for each $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$. If $K \in \mathcal{D}$ is a closed $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing set of Φ and the mapping $\Phi(t, \tau, \cdot, K(\tau, \cdot))$: $\Omega_m \to 2^X$ is weakly upper semicontinuous in the sense of Definition 2.2 for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, then the Ω-limit set $\Omega(K)$ is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. Since for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, the mapping $\omega \to \Phi(t, \tau, \omega, K(\tau, \omega))$ is weakly upper semicontinuous from Ω_m to 2^X, by Theorem 2.3, we find that the mapping $\Phi(t, \tau, \cdot, K(\tau, \cdot))$: $\Omega_m \to 2^X$ is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{B}(\Omega_m)$. Since $\Omega = \bigcup\limits_{m=1}^{\infty} \Omega_m$ and $\Omega_m \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ we infer that the mapping $\Phi(t, \tau, \cdot, K(\tau, \cdot))$: $\Omega \to 2^X$ is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$, which together with Lemma 2.12 yields the desired result. $\square$

As an immediate consequence of Lemmas 2.9 and 2.13 we have the following existence and uniqueness of non-autonomous random attractors.

Theorem 2.14. *Suppose X is a separable Banach space and Ω a metric space with $\Omega = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \Omega_m$ and $\Omega_m \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be an inclusion-closed collection of families of nonempty subsets of X and Φ be a multivalued non-autonomous cocycle on X over $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}(\Omega), P, \{\theta_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$. Suppose further:*

(i) Φ is $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotically compact in X.

(ii) $\Phi(t, \tau, \omega, \cdot) : X \to 2^X$ is upper semicontinuous for each $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$.

(iii) Φ has a closed $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing set $K \in \mathcal{D}$.

(iv) $\Phi(t, \tau, \cdot, K(\tau, \cdot))$: $\Omega_m \to 2^X$ is weakly upper semicontinuous in the sense of Definition 2.2 for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$.

Then Φ has a unique $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractor $\mathcal{A} = \Omega(K)$ in $\mathcal{D}$. If, in addition, both Φ and K are T-periodic, then so is the attractor $\mathcal{A}$.

3 Multivalued non-autonomous cocycles for wave equations

We will define a multi-valued non-autonomous cocycle in this section for problem (1.1)-(1.2), and then investigate the continuity properties of the solutions.

Let $z = u_t + \delta u$ where δ is a nonnegative number to be determined later. By (1.1) we get

$$\frac{du}{dt} + \delta u = z, \tag{3.1}$$

$$\frac{dz}{dt} + (\alpha - \delta)z + (\lambda + \delta^2 - \alpha\delta)u - \Delta u + f(x, u) = g(t, x) + \varepsilon u \circ \frac{dw}{dt}, \tag{3.2}$$

with initial conditions

$$u(x, \tau) = u_0(x), \quad z(x, \tau) = z_0(x), \tag{3.3}$$

where $z_0(x) = u_1(x) + \delta u_0(x)$. Throughout the rest of the paper, we assume $g \in L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}, L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$, $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function which along with its antiderivative $F(x, s) = \int_0^s f(x, s)ds$ satisfies: for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$|f(x, s)| \le c_1|s|^\gamma + \phi_1(x), \quad \phi_1 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), \tag{3.4}$$

$$f(x, s)s - c_2F(x, s) \ge \phi_2(x), \quad \phi_2 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n), \tag{3.5}$$

$$F(x, s) \ge c_3|s|^{\gamma+1} - \phi_3(x), \quad \phi_3 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n), \tag{3.6}$$

where c_1, c_2 and c_3 are positive constants, $\gamma \in [1, \infty)$ for $n = 1, 2$, and $\gamma \in [1, 3]$ for $n = 3$. In the three-dimensional case, $\gamma = 3$ is called the critical exponent.

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, \{\theta_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}})$ be the standard metric dynamical system where $\Omega = \{\omega \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) : \omega(0) = 0\}$ endowed with compact-open topology, $\mathcal{F}$ is the Borel σ-algebra, P is the Wiener measure on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$, and $\theta_t : \Omega \to \Omega$ is given by $\theta_t\omega(\cdot) = \omega(\cdot + t) - \omega(t)$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Consider the random variable $y : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$y(\omega) = -\alpha \int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{\alpha\tau}\omega(\tau)d\tau, \quad \omega \in \Omega. \tag{3.7}$$

Then the process $y(\theta_t\omega)$ satisfies

$$dy(\theta_t\omega) + \alpha y(\theta_t\omega)dt = dw. \tag{3.8}$$

It follows from [1] that there exists a θ_t-invariant subset of full measure (which is still denoted by Ω) such that $y(\theta_t\omega)$ is continuous in t and $y(\omega)$ is tempered in $\omega \in \Omega$.

Let v be a new variable given by $v(t, \tau, \omega) = z(t, \tau, \omega) - \varepsilon y(\theta_t\omega)u(t, \tau, \omega)$. By (3.1)-(3.3) we get

$$\frac{du}{dt} + \delta u - v = \varepsilon y(\theta_t\omega)u, \tag{3.9}$$

$$\frac{dv}{dt} + (\alpha - \delta)v + (\lambda + \delta^2 - \alpha\delta)u - \Delta u + f(x, u) = g - \varepsilon y(\theta_t\omega)v - \varepsilon\left(\varepsilon y(\theta_t\omega) - 2\delta\right) y(\theta_t\omega)u, \tag{3.10}$$

with initial conditions

$$u(\tau, x) = u_0(x), \quad v(\tau, x) = v_0(x), \tag{3.11}$$

where $v_0 = z_0 - \varepsilon y(\theta_\tau\omega)u_0$.

Note that problem (3.9)-(3.11) is a pathwise deterministic system parametrized by $\omega \in \Omega$. Then by the deterministic approach of [4], one can show that under conditions (3.4)-(3.6), for every $\omega \in \Omega$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $(u_0, v_0) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, system (3.9)-(3.11) has at least one solution, in the sense of [4], $(u(\cdot, \tau, \omega, u_0), v(\cdot, \tau, \omega, v_0)) \in C([\tau, \infty), H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$ with $(u(\tau, \tau, \omega, u_0), v(\tau, \tau, \omega, v_0)) = (u_0, v_0)$. This implies that $(u(\cdot, \tau, \omega, u_0), z(\cdot, \tau, \omega, z_0)) \in C([\tau, \infty), H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$ satisfies (3.1)-(3.3) with

$$z(t, \tau, \omega, z_0) = v(t, \tau, \omega, v_0) + \varepsilon y(\theta_t\omega)u(t, \tau, \omega, u_0). \tag{3.12}$$

Note that any solution (u, v) of (3.9)-(3.11) satisfies the energy equation:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}\left(\|v\|^2 + (\lambda + \delta^2 - \alpha\delta)\|u\|^2 + \|\nabla u\|^2 + 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x, u)dx\right) \\
&+2(\alpha - \delta)\|v\|^2 + 2\delta(\lambda + \delta^2 - \alpha\delta)\|u\|^2 + 2\delta\|\nabla u\|^2 + 2\delta(f(x, u), u) \\
&= 2(g, v) - 2\varepsilon y(\theta_t\omega)\|v\|^2 - 2\varepsilon(\varepsilon y(\theta_t\omega) - 2\delta)y(\theta_t\omega)(u, v) \\
&+ 2\varepsilon(\lambda + \delta^2 - \alpha\delta)y(\theta_t\omega)\|u\|^2 + 2\varepsilon y(\theta_t\omega)\|\nabla u\|^2 + 2\varepsilon y(\theta_t\omega)(f(x, u), u).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Formally, equation (3.13) can be obtained by taking the inner product of (3.10) with v in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and then using (3.9) to substitute for v in (u,v), $(\Delta u, v)$ and $(f(x,u),v)$ (see, e.g., [46]). This process can be justified by a limiting approach as in [4].

We will prove the weak and strong upper semicontinuity of the solutions of (3.9)-(3.11). To this end, for every positive integer $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we introduce a subset of Ω:

$$\Omega_m = \{\omega \in \Omega : |\omega(t)| \le |t| \quad \text{and} \quad |\int_0^t |y(\theta_r \omega)|^2 dr| \le \frac{1}{\alpha}|t| \quad \text{for all } |t| \ge m\}. \tag{3.14}$$

These subsets Ω_m with $m \in \mathbb{N}$ have the following properties:

Lemma 3.1. *Let y be the random variable given by* (3.7)*, and Ω_m be the subset of Ω given by* (3.14) *for $m \in \mathbb{N}$.*

(i) If $\omega_n \to \omega$ with $\omega_n, \omega \in \Omega_m$ for a fixed $m \in \mathbb{N}$, then $y(\theta_t \omega_n) \to y(\theta_t \omega)$ uniformly for t in any compact interval of $\mathbb{R}$. Particularly, if $t_n \to t$ and $\omega_n \to \omega$ with $\omega_n, \omega \in \Omega_m$ for a fixed m, then $y(\theta_{t_n} \omega_n) \to y(\theta_t \omega)$.

(ii) For every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, Ω_m is a closed subset of Ω and $\Omega = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \Omega_m$.

(iii) Given $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we have, for all $t \le -m$ and $\omega \in \Omega_m$,

$$|y(\theta_t \omega)| \le 2|t| + \alpha \int_{-\infty}^0 e^{\alpha\tau} |\tau| d\tau. \tag{3.15}$$

Proof. (i). Let $[a,b]$ be a compact interval of $\mathbb{R}$ and $\omega_n \to \omega$ with $\omega_n, \omega \in \Omega_m$. By (3.7) we get

$$y(\theta_t \omega) = -\alpha \int_{-\infty}^0 e^{\alpha\tau} \omega(t+\tau) d\tau + \omega(t) = -\alpha e^{-\alpha t} \int_{-\infty}^t e^{\alpha\tau} \omega(\tau) d\tau + \omega(t). \tag{3.16}$$

Therefore we have

$$|y(\theta_t \omega_n) - y(\theta_t \omega)| \le \alpha e^{-\alpha t} \left| \int_{-\infty}^t e^{\alpha\tau} (\omega_n(\tau) - \omega(\tau) d\tau \right| + |\omega_n(t) - \omega(t)|. \tag{3.17}$$

Since $\int_{-\infty}^0 e^{\alpha\tau}|\tau| d\tau < \infty$, given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $T_1 = T_1(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{-T_1} e^{\alpha\tau} |\tau| d\tau < \varepsilon. \tag{3.18}$$

Let $T = \max\{T_1, m, -a\}$. By (3.17)-(3.18) and the fact that $\omega_n, \omega \in \Omega_m$, we obtain, for all $t \in [a,b]$,

$$|y(\theta_t \omega_n) - y(\theta_t \omega)| \le \alpha e^{-\alpha t} \int_{-\infty}^t e^{\alpha\tau} |\omega_n(\tau) - \omega(\tau)| d\tau + |\omega_n(t) - \omega(t)|$$

$$\leq \alpha e^{-\alpha t} \int_{-\infty}^{-T} e^{\alpha \tau} |\omega_n(\tau) - \omega(\tau)| d\tau + \alpha e^{-\alpha t} \int_{-T}^{t} e^{\alpha \tau} |\omega_n(\tau) - \omega(\tau)| d\tau + |\omega_n(t) - \omega(t)|$$

$$\leq 2\alpha e^{-\alpha t} \int_{-\infty}^{-T} e^{\alpha \tau} |\tau| d\tau + \alpha e^{-\alpha t} \int_{-T}^{b} e^{\alpha \tau} |\omega_n(\tau) - \omega(\tau)| d\tau + |\omega_n(t) - \omega(t)|$$

$$\leq 2\alpha e^{-\alpha a} \varepsilon + \alpha e^{-\alpha a} \int_{-T}^{b} e^{\alpha \tau} |\omega_n(\tau) - \omega(\tau)| d\tau + |\omega_n(t) - \omega(t)|. \tag{3.19}$$

Since $\omega_n \to \omega$ with respect to the compact-open topology of Ω, there exists $N = N(\varepsilon) \geq 1$ such that for all $n \geq N$ and $t \in [a, b]$,

$$\alpha e^{-\alpha a} \int_{-T}^{b} e^{\alpha \tau} |\omega_n(\tau) - \omega(\tau)| d\tau \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad |\omega_n(t) - \omega(t)| \leq \varepsilon,$$

which together with (3.19) shows that for all $n \geq N$ and $t \in [a, b]$,

$$|y(\theta_t \omega_n) - y(\theta_t \omega)| \leq 2\alpha e^{-\alpha a} \varepsilon + 2\varepsilon.$$

In other words, we get

$$y(\theta_t \omega_n) \to y(\theta_t \omega) \text{ uniformly in } t \in [a, b]. \tag{3.20}$$

Now suppose $t_n \to t$ and $\omega_n \to \omega$ with $\omega_n, \omega \in \Omega_m$. Then we have

$$|y(\theta_{t_n} \omega_n) - y(\theta_t \omega)| \leq |y(\theta_{t_n} \omega_n) - y(\theta_{t_n} \omega)| + |y(\theta_{t_n} \omega) - y(\theta_t \omega)|$$

from which, (3.20) and the continuity of $y(\theta_t \omega)$ in t, we obtain

$$y(\theta_{t_n} \omega_n) \to y(\theta_t \omega), \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

(ii). Let $\omega_n \to \omega$ with $\omega_n \in \Omega_m$ and $\omega \in \Omega$. We will show $\omega \in \Omega_m$. Since $\omega_n \in \Omega_m$, we have for all $|t| \geq m$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|\omega_n(t)| \leq |t| \quad \text{and} \quad |\int_0^t |y(\theta_r \omega_n)|^2 dr| \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} |t|.$$

Taking the limit as $n \to \infty$, by (i) we obtain for all $|t| \geq m$,

$$|\omega(t)| \leq |t| \quad \text{and} \quad |\int_0^t |y(\theta_r \omega)|^2 dr| \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} |t|.$$

This indicates $\omega \in \Omega_m$ and hence Ω_m is a closed subset of Ω for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Given $\omega \in \Omega$, since $|\frac{\omega(t)}{t}| \to 0$ as $|t| \to \infty$, there exists $T_1 > 0$ such that for all $|t| \geq T_1$,

$$|\omega(t)| \leq |t|. \tag{3.21}$$

On the other hand, by the ergodicity theorem,

$$\lim_{|t|\to\infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t |y(\theta_r\omega)|^2 dr = \frac{1}{2\alpha},$$

which shows that there exists $T_2 \ge T_1$ such that for all $|t| \ge T_2$,

$$| \int_0^t |y(\theta_r\omega)|^2 dr| \le \frac{1}{\alpha}|t|. \tag{3.22}$$

By (3.21)-(3.22) we find $\omega \in \Omega_m$ for $m > T_2$ and thus $\Omega \subseteq \bigcup\limits_{m=1}^{\infty} \Omega_m$. It is evident that $\bigcup\limits_{m=1}^{\infty} \Omega_m \subseteq \Omega$, and hence $\Omega = \bigcup\limits_{m=1}^{\infty} \Omega_m$.

(iii). By (3.16) we have, for all $\omega \in \Omega_m$, $t \le -m$ and $\tau \le 0$,

$$|y(\theta_t\omega)| \le \alpha \int_{-\infty}^0 e^{\alpha\tau} |\omega(t+\tau)| d\tau + |\omega(t)|$$

$$\le \alpha \int_{-\infty}^0 e^{\alpha\tau} (|t| + |\tau|) d\tau + |t| \le 2|t| + \alpha \int_{-\infty}^0 e^{\alpha\tau} |\tau| d\tau$$

which yields (3.15). □

We mention that a similar subset of Ω was introduced in [7] to deal with the measurability of solutions of stochastic equations without uniqueness, which works for many equations perturbed by *additive* noise, but does not work for equations with *multiplicative* noise like (1.1). That is why, in the present paper, we consider the subset Ω_m given by (3.14) and show this subset can be used to establish the measurability of the solutions of (1.1).

From now on, we write $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega_m}$ for the trace σ-algebra of $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to Ω_m, and P_{Ω_m} for the restriction of P to $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega_m}$. Sometimes, it is convenient to consider the measurable space $(\Omega_m, \mathcal{F}_{\Omega_m}, P_{\Omega_m})$ instead of the original space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$. Since Ω_m is a closed subset of Ω by Lemma 3.1, we find that $\mathcal{F}_{\Omega_m} \subset \mathcal{F}$.

It is convenient to reformulate system (3.9)-(3.10)as

$$\frac{d\xi}{dt} = A\xi + G(x, t, \omega, \xi), \tag{3.23}$$

where

$$\xi = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix}, \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ \Delta & \delta - \alpha \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$G(x, t, \omega, \xi) = \begin{pmatrix} -\delta u + \varepsilon y(\theta_t\omega) u \\ g - (\lambda + \delta^2 - \alpha\delta) u - f(x, u) - \varepsilon y(\theta_t\omega) v - \varepsilon \left(\varepsilon y(\theta_t\omega) - 2\delta\right) y(\theta_t\omega) u \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.24}$$

As proved in [4], if $\xi \in C([\tau,\infty), H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$ is a weak solution of (3.9)-(3.11), then ξ satisfies

$$\xi(t,\tau,\omega,\xi_0) = e^{A(t-\tau)}\xi_0 + \int_\tau^t e^{A(t-s)} G(\cdot, s, \omega, \xi(s,\tau,\omega,\xi_0))ds. \tag{3.25}$$

The mapping G given by(3.24) has the following property which proves useful later.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose* (3.4)-(3.6) *hold. Then we have*

(i) if $\xi_n \rightharpoonup \xi$ *in* $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *and* $\omega_n \to \omega$ *with* $\omega_n, \omega \in \Omega_m$*, then* $G(\cdot,t,\omega_n,\xi_n) \rightharpoonup G(\cdot,t,\omega,\xi)$ *in* $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *uniformly for* t *in compact intervals of* R*.*

(ii) if $\xi_n \to \xi$ *strongly in* $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *and* $\omega_n \to \omega$ *with* $\omega_n, \omega \in \Omega_m$*, then* $G(\cdot,t,\omega_n,\xi_n) \to G(\cdot,t,\omega,\xi)$ *strongly in* $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *uniformly for* t *in compact intervals of* $\mathbb{R}$*.*

Proof. (i). Suppose $\xi_n = \begin{pmatrix} u_n \\ v_n \end{pmatrix}$, $\xi = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix}$ and $\xi_n \rightharpoonup \xi$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. By (3.4) we find that $f(\cdot,u_n)$ is bounded in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and hence there is $\phi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that, up to a subsequence,

$$f(\cdot,u_n) \rightharpoonup \phi \text{ in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^n). \tag{3.26}$$

Let $B_k = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x\| < k\}$ for each positive integer k. By the compactness of embedding $H^1(B_k) \hookrightarrow L^2(B_k)$, for every fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a subsequence (depending on k) of $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ that is convergent in $L^2(B_k)$ and almost everywhere on B_k. Then by a diagonal process, we can extract a further subsequence (which is still denoted by $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$) such that

$$u_n \to u \text{ a.e. on } \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{3.27}$$

which implies that

$$f(x,u_n(x)) \to f(u(x)) \text{ for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{3.28}$$

By (3.26), (3.28) and the Mazur's theorem, we get $\phi = f(u)$ and thus the entire sequence $f(\cdot,u_n) \rightharpoonup \phi$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. This together with (3.24) and Lemma 3.1 (i) implies $G(\cdot,t,\omega_n,\xi_n) \rightharpoonup G(\cdot,t,\omega,\xi)$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ uniformly for t in a compact interval.

(ii). By (3.4) we have

$$f^2(x,u_n(x)) \le g_n(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{3.29}$$

where $g_n(x) = 2c_1^2|u_n(x)|^{2\gamma} + \phi_1^2(x)$. If $u_n \to u$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, then $g_n \to g$ in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, which along with (3.27), (3.29) and the dominated convergence theorem yields

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f^2(x,u_n(x))dx \to \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f^2(x,u(x))dx. \tag{3.30}$$

By (3.30) and the weak convergence of $f(\cdot,u_n)$ we get $f(\cdot,u_n) \to f(\cdot,u)$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then using (3.24) and Lemma 3.1 (i) we infer that $G(\cdot,t,\omega_n,\xi_n) \to G(\cdot,t,\omega,\xi)$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ uniformly for t in a compact interval. ☐

The following lemma provides estimates of solutions of (3.9)-(3.11) which are uniform in time and initial data on a bounded set.

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose* (3.4)-(3.6) *hold. Let* $\varepsilon \geq 0$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $T > 0$, $M > 0$ *and* $\omega_n \to \omega$ *with* $\omega_n, \omega \in \Omega_m$. *Then there exists* $C = C(\varepsilon, \tau, T, M, m, \omega) > 0$ *such that the solutions of* (3.9)-(3.11) *satisfy*

$$\|u(t,\tau,\omega_n,u_0)\|_{H^1} + \|v(t,\tau,\omega_n,v_0)\|_{L^2} \leq C$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $t \in [\tau, \tau+T]$ *and* $(u_0, v_0) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *with* $\|(u_0,v_0)\|_{H^1\times L^2} \leq M$.

Proof. By (3.13) with $\delta = 0$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}\left(\|v\|^2 + \lambda\|u\|^2 + \|\nabla u\|^2 + 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x,u)dx\right)\\ &\leq 2(g,v) - 2\varepsilon y(\theta_t\omega)\|v\|^2 - 2\varepsilon^2|y(\theta_t\omega)|^2(u,v)\\ &+ 2\varepsilon\lambda y(\theta_t\omega)\|u\|^2 + 2\varepsilon y(\theta_t\omega)\|\nabla u\|^2 + 2\varepsilon y(\theta_t\omega)(f(x,u),u).\end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

By (3.4) and (3.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}2\varepsilon y(\theta_t\omega)(f(x,u),u) &\leq 2\varepsilon c_1|y(\theta_t\omega)|\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}|u|^{\gamma+1}dx + \varepsilon|y(\theta_t\omega)|\|\phi_1\|^2 + \varepsilon|y(\theta_t\omega)|\|u\|^2\\ &\leq \varepsilon c|y(\theta_t\omega)|\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}F(x,u)dx + \varepsilon c|y(\theta_t\omega)| + \varepsilon|y(\theta_t\omega)|\|u\|^2.\end{aligned} \tag{3.32}$$

It follows from (3.31)-(3.32) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}\left(\|v\|^2 + \lambda\|u\|^2 + \|\nabla u\|^2 + 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x,u)dx\right)\\ &\leq \|g\|^2 + (1 + 2\varepsilon|y(\theta_t\omega)| + \varepsilon^2|y(\theta_t\omega)|^2)\|v\|^2 + \varepsilon|y(\theta_t\omega)|(1 + 2\lambda + \varepsilon|y(\theta_t\omega)|)\|u\|^2\\ &+2\varepsilon|y(\theta_t\omega)|\|\nabla u\|^2 + \varepsilon c|y(\theta_t\omega)|\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}F(x,u)dx + \varepsilon c|y(\theta_t\omega)|.\end{aligned}$$

Integrating the above over (τ, t) and replacing ω by ω_n we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\|v(t,\tau,\omega_n,v_0)\|^2 + \lambda\|u(t,\tau,\omega_n,u_0)\|^2\\ &+\|\nabla u(t,\tau,\omega_n,u_0)\|^2 + 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}F(x,u(t,\tau,\omega_n,u_0))dx\\ &\leq \|v_0\|^2 + \lambda\|u_0\|^2 + \|\nabla u_0\|^2 + 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}F(x,u_0)dx\\ &+\int_\tau^t\|g(s)\|^2ds + \int_\tau^t(1 + 2\varepsilon|y(\theta_s\omega_n)| + \varepsilon^2|y(\theta_s\omega_n)|^2)\|v(s,\tau,\omega_n,v_0)\|^2ds\end{aligned}$$

$$+\varepsilon \int_{\tau}^{t} |y(\theta_s\omega_n)|(1+2\lambda+\varepsilon|y(\theta_s\omega_n)|)\|u(s,\tau,\omega_n,u_0)\|^2 ds$$

$$+2\varepsilon \int_{\tau}^{t} |y(\theta_s\omega_n)|\|\nabla u(s,\tau,\omega_n,u_0)\|^2 ds$$

$$+\varepsilon c \int_{\tau}^{t}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |y(\theta_s\omega_n)|F(x,u)dxds + \varepsilon c\int_{\tau}^{t} |y(\theta_s\omega_n)|ds. \tag{3.33}$$

Since $\omega_n \to \omega$ and $\omega_n, \omega \in \Omega_m$, by Lemma 3.1 we know that $y(\theta_r\omega_n) \to y(\theta_r\omega)$ uniformly for $r \in [\tau, \tau+T]$ as $n \to \infty$. Therefore, there exists $N = N(T,\tau,\omega) \geq 1$ such that for all $n \geq N$ and $r \in [\tau, \tau+T]$,

$$|y(\theta_r\omega_n)| \leq 1 + |y(\theta_r\omega)|,$$

which together with the continuity of $y(\theta_r\omega)$ in r implies that there exists $C_1 = C_1(T,\tau,\omega) > 0$ such that for all $n \geq N$ and $r \in [\tau, \tau+T]$,

$$|y(\theta_r\omega)| \leq C_1 \quad \text{and} \quad |y(\theta_r\omega_n)| \leq 1 + C_1. \tag{3.34}$$

It follows from (3.33)-(3.34) that there exists $C_2 = C_2(T,\tau,\omega) > 0$ such that for all $n \geq N$ and $t \in [\tau, \tau+T]$,

$$\|v(t,\tau,\omega_n,v_0)\|^2 + \lambda\|u(t,\tau,\omega_n,u_0)\|^2$$

$$+\|\nabla u(t,\tau,\omega_n,u_0)\|^2 + 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x,u(t,\tau,\omega_n,u_0))dx$$

$$\leq \|v_0\|^2 + \lambda\|u_0\|^2 + \|\nabla u_0\|^2 + 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x,u_0)dx$$

$$+\int_{\tau}^{t} \|g(s)\|^2 ds + (1+\varepsilon+\varepsilon^2)C_2\int_{\tau}^{t} \|v(s,\tau,\omega_n,v_0)\|^2 ds$$

$$+\varepsilon(1+\varepsilon)C_2\int_{\tau}^{t} \|u(s,\tau,\omega_n,u_0)\|^2 ds + \varepsilon C_2\int_{\tau}^{t} \|\nabla u(s,\tau,\omega_n,u_0)\|^2 ds$$

$$+\varepsilon c\int_{\tau}^{t}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |y(\theta_s\omega_n)|F(x,u)dxds + \varepsilon C_2. \tag{3.35}$$

By (3.6) we have $F(x,u) + \phi_3(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, from which and (3.34) we find that there exists $C_3 = C_3(T,\tau,\omega) > 0$ such that for all $n \geq N$ and $t \in [\tau, \tau+T]$,

$$\varepsilon c\int_{\tau}^{t}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |y(\theta_s\omega_n)|F(x,u)dxds \leq \varepsilon C_3\int_{\tau}^{t}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x,u(s))dxds + \varepsilon C_3. \tag{3.36}$$

Let $C_4 = \max\{(1+\varepsilon+\varepsilon^2)C_2, \varepsilon(1+\varepsilon)C_2\lambda^{-1}, \varepsilon C_2, \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon C_3\}$. By (3.35) and (3.36) we get, for all $n \geq N$ and $t \in [\tau, \tau+T]$,

$$\|v(t,\tau,\omega_n,v_0)\|^2 + \lambda\|u(t,\tau,\omega_n,u_0)\|^2$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\|\nabla u(t,\tau,\omega_n,u_0)\|^2 + 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x,u(t,\tau,\omega_n,u_0))dx \\
&\le \|v_0\|^2 + \lambda\|u_0\|^2 + \|\nabla u_0\|^2 + 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x,u_0)dx \\
&+ \int_\tau^t \|g(s)\|^2 ds + C_4\int_\tau^t \|v(s,\tau,\omega_n,v_0)\|^2 ds \\
&+C_4\lambda\int_\tau^t \|u(s,\tau,\omega_n,u_0)\|^2 ds + C_4\int_\tau^t \|\nabla u(s,\tau,\omega_n,u_0)\|^2 ds \\
&+ \varepsilon C_3\int_\tau^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x,u(s))dxds + \varepsilon(C_2+C_3).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.37}
$$

Since $C_4 \ge \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon C_3$, by (3.6) we see that there exists $C_5 > 0$ such that

$$
\varepsilon C_3\int_\tau^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x,u(s))dxds \le 2C_4\int_\tau^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x,u(s))dxds + C_5(1+\varepsilon). \tag{3.38}
$$

It follows from (3.37)-(3.38) that for all $n \ge N$ and $t \in [\tau, \tau+T]$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\|v(t,\tau,\omega_n,v_0)\|^2 + \lambda\|u(t,\tau,\omega_n,u_0)\|^2 \\
&+\|\nabla u(t,\tau,\omega_n,u_0)\|^2 + 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x,u(t,\tau,\omega_n,u_0))dx \\
&\le \|v_0\|^2 + \lambda\|u_0\|^2 + \|\nabla u_0\|^2 + 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x,u_0)dx + C_4\int_\tau^t \|v(s,\tau,\omega_n,v_0)\|^2 ds \\
&+C_4\lambda\int_\tau^t \|u(s,\tau,\omega_n,u_0)\|^2 ds + C_4\int_\tau^t \|\nabla u(s,\tau,\omega_n,u_0)\|^2 ds \\
&+ 2C_4\int_\tau^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x,u(s))dxds + (1+\varepsilon)C_6 + \int_\tau^t \|g(s)\|^2 ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.39}
$$

By Gronwall's inequality, we get from (3.39) that for all $n \ge N$ and $t \in [\tau, \tau+T]$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\|v(t,\tau,\omega_n,v_0)\|^2 + \lambda\|u(t,\tau,\omega_n,u_0)\|^2 \\
&+\|\nabla u(t,\tau,\omega_n,u_0)\|^2 + 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x,u(t,\tau,\omega_n,u_0))dx \\
&\le e^{C_4T}\left(\|v_0\|^2 + \lambda\|u_0\|^2 + \|\nabla u_0\|^2 + 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x,u_0)dx + (1+\varepsilon)C_6\right) + \int_\tau^t e^{-C_4(s-t)}g(s)ds,
\end{aligned}
$$

which along with (3.4) and (3.6) yields the desired estimates. □

Next, we prove the solutions of (3.9)-(3.11) are uniformly small outside a large bounded domain under certain conditions.

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose* (3.4)-(3.6) *hold,* $\varepsilon \geq 0$*,* $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$*,* $T > 0$*, and* $\omega_n \to \omega$ *with* $\omega_n, \omega \in \Omega_m$*. Let* $(u(\cdot, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n}), v(\cdot, \tau, \omega_n, v_{0,n}))$ *be a solution of* (3.9)-(3.11) *with initial data* $(u_{0,n}, v_{0,n})$ *at initial time* τ*. If* $(u_{0,n}, v_{0,n}) \to (u_0, v_0)$ *in* $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$*, then for every* $\eta > 0$*, there exist* $N = N(\varepsilon, \tau, T, m, \omega, \eta) \geq 1$ *and* $K = K(\varepsilon, \tau, T, m, \omega, \eta) \geq 1$ *such that for all* $n \geq N$ *and* $t \in [\tau, \tau + T]$*,*

$$\int_{|x| \geq K} \left(|u(t, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n})|^2 + |\nabla u(t, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n})|^2 + |v(t, \tau, \omega_n, v_{0,n})|^2 \right) dx \leq \eta. \tag{3.40}$$

Proof. We here formally derive the estimate of (3.40) which can be justified by a limiting method as in [4]. Let $\rho : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function such that $0 \leq \rho \leq 1$ and

$$\rho(s) = 0 \quad \text{for } |s| < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(s) = 1 \quad \text{for } |s| > 2. \tag{3.41}$$

Setting $\delta = 0$ and taking the inner product of (3.10) with $\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right) v$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we get

$$\begin{gathered}
\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)|v|^2 dx + \alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)|v|^2 dx \\
+\lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right) uv dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right) v \Delta u dx \\
+\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right) f(x,u) v dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right) g v dx \\
-\varepsilon y(\theta_t \omega) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)|v|^2 dx - \varepsilon^2 y^2(\theta_t \omega) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right) uv dx,
\end{gathered}$$

which along with (3.9) implies

$$\begin{gathered}
\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)\left(|v|^2 + \lambda |u|^2 + |\nabla u|^2 + 2F(x,u)\right) dx + 2\alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)|v|^2 dx \\
= 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right) g v dx - 2\varepsilon y(\theta_t \omega) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)|v|^2 dx \\
-2\varepsilon^2 y^2(\theta_t \omega) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right) uv dx + 2\varepsilon \lambda y(\theta_t \omega) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)|u|^2 dx \\
+2\varepsilon y(\theta_t \omega) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)|\nabla u|^2 dx + 2\varepsilon y(\theta_t \omega) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right) f(x,u) u dx \\
- 4\int_{k \leq |x| \leq \sqrt{2}k} \rho'\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right) v \nabla u \frac{x}{k^2} dx.
\end{gathered} \tag{3.42}$$

By (3.4) and (3.6) we have

$$2\varepsilon |y(\theta_t \omega)| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right) f(x,u) u dx \leq \varepsilon C |y(\theta_t \omega)| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right) F(x,u) dx$$

$$+\varepsilon C|y(\theta_t\omega)|\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)|u|^2dx+\varepsilon C|y(\theta_t\omega)|\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)(|\phi_1|^2+|\phi_3|)dx. \tag{3.43}$$

By (3.42)-(3.43) and Young's inequality, we obtain (after replacing ω by ω_n),

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)\left(|v(t,\tau,\omega_n,v_{0,n})|^2+\lambda|u(t,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n})|^2+|\nabla u|^2+2F(x,u)\right)dx$$

$$\le\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)|v(t,\tau,\omega_n,v_{0,n})|^2\left(1+2\varepsilon|y(\theta_t\omega_n)|+\varepsilon^2|y(\theta_t\omega_n)|^2\right)dx$$

$$+\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)|u(t,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n})|^2\left(\varepsilon^2|y(\theta_t\omega_n)|^2+2\varepsilon\lambda|y(\theta_t\omega_n)|+\varepsilon C|y(\theta_t\omega_n)|\right)dx$$

$$+2\varepsilon|y(\theta_t\omega_n)|\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)|\nabla u|^2dx+\varepsilon C|y(\theta_t\omega_n)|\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)F(x,u)dx$$

$$+\varepsilon C|y(\theta_t\omega_n)|\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)(|\phi_1|^2+|\phi_3|)dx+\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)|g|^2dx$$

$$+\frac{C}{k}\left(\|\nabla u(t,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n})\|^2+\|v(t,\tau,\omega_n,v_{0,n})\|^2\right). \tag{3.44}$$

Since $(u_{0,n},v_{0,n})\to(u_0,v_0)$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\omega_n\to\omega$, by Lemma 3.3 we find that $(u(t,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n}),v(t,\tau,\omega_n,v_{0,n}))$ is uniformly bounded in $[\tau,\tau+T]$ for $n\in\mathbb{N}$, Therefore, there exists $K_1\ge1$ such that for all $k\ge K_1$, $t\in[\tau,\tau+T]$ and $n\in\mathbb{N}$,

$$\frac{C}{k}\left(\|\nabla u(t,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n})\|^2+\|v(t,\tau,\omega_n,v_{0,n})\|^2\right)\le\eta. \tag{3.45}$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 3.1 (i) we know $y(\theta_t\omega_n)\to y(\theta_t\omega)$ uniformly for $t\in[\tau,\tau+T]$ as $n\to\infty$, and thus there exists $C_1>0$ and $N_1\ge1$ such that for all $n\ge N_1$ and $t\in[\tau,\tau+T]$,

$$|y(\theta_t\omega)|\le C_1\quad\text{and}\quad|y(\theta_t\omega_n)|\le C_1. \tag{3.46}$$

By (3.6) and (3.46) we get, for $n\ge N_1$,

$$\varepsilon C|y(\theta_t\omega_n)|\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)F(x,u)dx$$

$$\le\varepsilon CC_1\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)F(x,u)dx+2\varepsilon CC_1\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)|\phi_3(x)|dx. \tag{3.47}$$

If follows from (3.6) and (3.44)-(3) that there exists $C_2>0$ such that for all $n\ge N_1$, $k\ge K_1$ and $t\in[\tau,\tau+T]$,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)\left(|v(t,\tau,\omega_n,v_{0,n})|^2+\lambda|u(t,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n})|^2+|\nabla u|^2+2F(x,u)\right)dx$$

$$\le C_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right) \left(|v(t,\tau,\omega_n,v_{0,n})|^2 + \lambda|u(t,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n})|^2 + |\nabla u|^2 + 2F(x,u)\right) dx$$

$$+ C_2 \int_{|x|\ge k} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right) (|\phi_1|^2 + |g|^2 + |\phi_3|) dx + \eta. \tag{3.48}$$

Note that there exists $K_2 \ge K_1$ such that for all $k \ge K_2$,

$$C_2 \int_{|x|\ge k} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right) (|\phi_1(x)|^2 + |g(x)|^2 + |\phi_3(x)|) dx \le \eta. \tag{3.49}$$

By (3.48)-(3.49) and Gronwall's lemma, we obtain, for all $n \ge N_1$, $k \ge K_2$ and $t \in [\tau, \tau+T]$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right) \left(|v(t,\tau,\omega_n,v_{0,n})|^2 + \lambda|u(t,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n})|^2 + |\nabla u|^2 + 2F(x,u)\right) dx$$

$$\le e^{C_2 T} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right) \left(|v_{0,n}|^2 + \lambda|u_{0,n}|^2 + |\nabla u_{0,n}|^2 + 2F(x,u_{0,n})\right) dx + 2\eta C_2^{-1} e^{C_2 T}. \tag{3.50}$$

Since $(u_0, v_0) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, there exists $K_3 \ge K_2$ such that for all $k \ge K_3$,

$$\int_{|x|\ge k} (|u_0(x)|^2 + |\nabla u_0(x)|^2 + |v_0(x)|^2) dx \le \frac{\eta}{4}. \tag{3.51}$$

Since $(u_{0,n}, v_{0,n}) \to (u_0, v_0)$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, there exists $N_2 \ge N_1$ such that for all $n \ge N_2$,

$$\int_{|x|\ge k} (|u_{0,n}(x) - u_0(x)|^2 + |\nabla u_{0,n}(x) - \nabla u_0(x)|^2 + |v_{0,n}(x) - v_0(x)|^2) dx$$

$$\le \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (|u_{0,n}(x) - u_0(x)|^2 + |\nabla u_{0,n}(x) - \nabla u_0(x)|^2 + |v_{0,n}(x) - v_0(x)|^2) dx \le \frac{\eta}{4}$$

which together with (3.51) implies that for all $n \ge N_2$ and $k \ge K_3$,

$$\int_{|x|\ge k} (|u_{0,n}(x)|^2 + |\nabla u_{0,n}(x)|^2 + |v_{0,n}(x)|^2) dx \le \eta. \tag{3.52}$$

By (3.4) and (3.52) we find that there exists $C_3 > 0$ such that for all $n \ge N_2$ and $k \ge K_3$,

$$e^{C_2 T} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right) \left(|v_{0,n}|^2 + \lambda|u_{0,n}|^2 + |\nabla u_{0,n}|^2 + 2F(x,u_{0,n})\right) dx$$

$$\le e^{C_2 T} \int_{|x|\ge k} (|v_{0,n}|^2 + \lambda|u_{0,n}|^2 + |\nabla u_{0,n}|^2) dx$$

$$+ 2e^{C_2 T} \int_{|x|\ge k} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right) F(x,u_{0,n}) dx \le C_3 \eta. \tag{3.53}$$

By (3.6), (3.50) and (3.53) we get, for all $n \geq N_2$, $k \geq K_3$ and $t \in [\tau, \tau + T]$,

$$\int_{|x| \geq \sqrt{2}k} \left(|v(t, \tau, \omega_n, v_{0,n})|^2 + \lambda |u(t, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n})|^2 + |\nabla u|^2 \right) dx$$

$$\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho \left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2} \right) \left(|v(t, \tau, \omega_n, v_{0,n})|^2 + \lambda |u(t, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n})|^2 + |\nabla u|^2 \right) dx \leq C_4 \eta.$$

This completes the proof. □

Next, we discuss the weak and strong continuity of solutions of system (3.9)-(3.11).

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose* (3.4)-(3.6) *hold,* $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $t_n \to t$ *with* $t_n \geq \tau$ *and* $\omega_n \to \omega$ *with* $\omega_n, \omega \in \Omega_m$. *Let* $(u(\cdot, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n}), v(\cdot, \tau, \omega_n, v_{0,n}))$ *be a solution of* (3.9)-(3.11) *with initial data* $(u_{0,n}, v_{0,n})$ *at initial time* τ.

(i) If $(u_{0,n}, v_{0,n}) \rightharpoonup (u_0, v_0)$ *in* $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, *then system* (3.9)-(3.11) *has a solution* $(u, v) = (u(\cdot, \tau, \omega, u_0), v(\cdot, \tau, \omega, v_0))$ *with initial condition* (u_0, v_0) *at initial time* τ *such that, up to a subsequence,*

$$u(t_n, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n}) \rightharpoonup u(t, \tau, \omega, u_0) \text{ in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

and

$$v(t_n, \tau, \omega_n, v_{0,n}) \rightharpoonup v(t, \tau, \omega, v_0) \text{ in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

(ii) If $(u_{0,n}, v_{0,n}) \to (u_0, v_0)$ *in* $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, *then system* (3.9)-(3.11) *has a solution* $(u, v) = (u(\cdot, \tau, \omega, u_0), v(\cdot, \tau, \omega, v_0))$ *with initial condition* (u_0, v_0) *at initial time* τ *such that, up to a subsequence,*

$$u(t_n, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n}) \to u(t, \tau, \omega, u_0) \text{ in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

and

$$v(t_n, \tau, \omega_n, v_{0,n}) \to v(t, \tau, \omega, v_0) \text{ in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Proof. (i). Since $t_n \to t$ with $t_n \geq \tau$ and $(u_{0,n}, v_{0,n}) \rightharpoonup (u_0, v_0)$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, there exist $T > 0$ and $M > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$t_n, t \in [\tau, \tau + T] \quad \text{and} \quad \|(u_{0,n}, v_{0,n})\|_{H^1 \times L^2} \leq M. \tag{3.54}$$

Since $\omega_n \to \omega$ with $\omega_n, \omega \in \Omega_m$, by (3.54) and Lemma 3.3 there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $r \in [\tau, \tau + T]$,

$$\|u(r, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n})\|_{H^1} + \|v(r, \tau, \omega_n, v_{0,n})\|_{L^2} \leq C. \tag{3.55}$$

Let $\xi_{0,n} = \begin{pmatrix} u_{0,n} \\ v_{0,n} \end{pmatrix}$ and $\xi_n(r,\tau,\omega_n,\xi_{0,n}) = \begin{pmatrix} u(r,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n}) \\ v(r,\tau,\omega_n,v_{0,n}) \end{pmatrix}$. By (3.25) we get for all $r \geq \tau$ and $\psi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$< \xi_n(r,\tau,\omega_n,\xi_{0,n}), \psi > = < e^{A(r-\tau)}\xi_{0,n}, \psi >$$
$$+ \int_\tau^r < e^{A(r-s)} G(\cdot, s, \omega_n, \xi_n(s,\tau,\omega_n,\xi_{0,n})), \psi > ds, \tag{3.56}$$

where $< \cdot, \cdot >$ is the inner product of $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Let $G_1(s) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ g(s) \end{pmatrix}$ and $G_2(x,s,\omega_n,\xi_n) = G(x,s,\omega_n,\xi_n) - G_1(s)$. Then by (3.24), (3.55) and Lemma 3.1 (i), we find that there exists $C_1 > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s \in [\tau, \tau+T]$,

$$\| G_2(\cdot, s, \omega_n, \xi_n(s,\tau,\omega_n,\xi_{0,n}) \|_{H^1 \times L^2} \leq C_1. \tag{3.57}$$

We now prove the equicontinuity of $< \xi_n(r,\tau,\omega_n,\xi_{0,n}), \psi >$ by the approach of [4]. By (3) we have for $r, r+p \in [\tau, \tau+T]$ with $p \geq 0$,

$$< \xi_n(r+p,\tau,\omega_n,\xi_{0,n}) - \xi_n(r,\tau,\omega_n,\xi_{0,n}), \psi >$$
$$= < (e^{A(r+p-\tau)} - e^{A(r-\tau)})\xi_{0,n}, \psi >$$
$$+ \int_\tau^r < (e^{A(r+p-s)} - e^{A(r-s)}) G(\cdot, s, \omega_n, \xi_n(s,\tau,\omega_n,\xi_{0,n})), \psi > ds$$
$$+ \int_r^{r+p} < e^{A(r+p-s)} G(\cdot, s, \omega_n, \xi_n(s,\tau,\omega_n,\xi_{0,n})), \psi > ds. \tag{3.58}$$

Given $\eta_1 > 0$ and $M > 0$, it follows from [4] that there exists $\eta_2 > 0$ such that

$$| < (e^{A(r+p)} - e^{Ar})\phi, \psi > | \leq \eta_1 \tag{3.59}$$

for all $\|\phi\|_{H^1 \times L^2} \leq M$ and $r, r+p \in [0,T]$ with $0 \leq p \leq \eta_2$. By (3.57)-(3.59) we obtain the equicontinuity of $< \xi_n(r,\tau,\omega_n,\xi_{0,n}), \psi >$. Therefore, as in [4], we find that there exist a subsequence $\xi_{n'}(r,\tau,\omega_{n'},\xi_{0,n'})$ and a weakly continuous mapping $\xi : [\tau, \tau+T] \to H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\xi(\tau) = \begin{pmatrix} u_0 \\ v_0 \end{pmatrix}$ such that

$$\xi_{n'}(r,\tau,\omega_{n'},\xi_{0,n'}) \rightharpoonup \xi(r), \quad \text{uniformly for } \; r \in [\tau, \tau+T]. \tag{3.60}$$

Note that the subsequence $\xi_{n'}(r,\tau,\omega_{n'},\xi_{0,n'})$ satisfies (3). By taking the limit as $n' \to \infty$, using (3), (3.57), (3.60), the weak continuity of e^{Ar} and Lemma 3.2 (i), we can get for $r \in [\tau, \tau+T]$,

$$< \xi(r), \psi > = < e^{A(r-\tau)}\xi(\tau), \psi > + \int_\tau^r < e^{A(r-s)} G(\cdot, s, \omega, \xi(s)), \psi > ds. \tag{3.61}$$

Thus ξ is a weak solution of (3.9)-(3.10) with initial condition $\xi_0 = \xi(\tau)$ at initial time τ, that is, $\xi = \xi(r, \tau, \omega, \xi_0)$ for $r \in [\tau, \tau + T]$. By a diagonal process, we can choose a further subsequence (not relabeled) such that

$$\xi_{n'}(r, \tau, \omega_{n'}, \xi_{0,n'}) \rightharpoonup \xi(r, \tau, \omega, \xi_0), \quad \text{uniformly for } r \text{ in any compact interval of } \mathbb{R}. \tag{3.62}$$

Since $t_n \to t$, by (3.62) we obtain

$$\xi_{n'}(t_{n'}, \tau, \omega_{n'}, \xi_{0,n'}) \rightharpoonup \xi(t, \tau, \omega, \xi_0), \tag{3.63}$$

as desired.

(ii). We now suppose $(u_{0,n}, v_{0,n}) \to (u_0, v_0)$ strongly in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $t_n \to t$. Next, we show the weak convergence of (3.63) is actually a strong convergence under the current conditions. For convenience, in the sequel, we will write the subsequence $\xi_{n'}(r, \tau, \omega_{n'}, \xi_{0,n'})$ as $\xi_n(r, \tau, \omega_n, \xi_{0,n})$.

Choose a positive number T such that $t_n, t \in [\tau, \tau + T]$. Let $E_1 : H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \to \mathbb{R}$ be a functional given by, for $(u, v) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$E_1(u, v) = \|v\|^2 + \lambda \|u\|^2 + \|\nabla u\|^2 + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x, u) dx. \tag{3.64}$$

It follows from (3.13) with $\delta = 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dE_1}{dt} &= -2\alpha \|v\|^2 + 2(g, v) - 2\varepsilon y(\theta_t \omega) \|v\|^2 - 2\varepsilon^2 y^2(\theta_t \omega)(u, v) \\ &+ 2\varepsilon \lambda y(\theta_t \omega) \|u\|^2 + 2\varepsilon y(\theta_t \omega) \|\nabla u\|^2 + 2\varepsilon y(\theta_t \omega)(f(x, u), u). \end{aligned} \tag{3.65}$$

Since the sign of $y(\theta_t \omega)$ is indefinite, so are the coefficients of $\|v\|^2$, $\|u\|^2$ and $\|\nabla u\|^2$ in (3.65). This prevents us from applying Fatou's Theorem to estimate the integrals of these terms in time. To solve the problem, we add $-2\varepsilon |y(\theta_t \omega)| E_1$ to both sides of (3.65) to make these terms negative. By doing so, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dE_1}{dt} - 2\varepsilon |y(\theta_t \omega)| E_1 &= -2(\alpha + \varepsilon(|y(\theta_t \omega)| + y(\theta_t \omega))) \|v\|^2 \\ -2\varepsilon\lambda(|y(\theta_t \omega)| - y(\theta_t \omega)) \|u\|^2 &- 2\varepsilon(|y(\theta_t \omega)| - y(\theta_t \omega)) \|\nabla u\|^2 \\ + 2\varepsilon y(\theta_t \omega)(f(x, u), u) - 4\varepsilon |y(\theta_t \omega)| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} & F(x, u) dx - 2\varepsilon^2 y^2(\theta_t \omega)(u, v) + 2(g, v). \end{aligned} \tag{3.66}$$

Solving for E_1 from (3.66) on $[\tau, t]$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} E_1(u(t, \tau, \omega, u_0), v(t, \tau, \omega, v_0)) &= e^{-2\varepsilon \int_t^\tau |y(\theta_r \omega)| dr} E_1(u_0, v_0) \\ -2 \int_\tau^t e^{-2\varepsilon \int_t^s |y(\theta_r \omega)| dr} (\alpha + \varepsilon(|y(\theta_s \omega)| &+ y(\theta_s \omega))) \|v(s, \tau, \omega, v_0)\|^2 ds \end{aligned}$$

$$-2\varepsilon\lambda\int_\tau^t e^{-2\varepsilon\int_t^s|y(\theta_r\omega)|dr}(|y(\theta_s\omega)|-y(\theta_s\omega))\|u(s,\tau,\omega,u_0)\|^2ds$$

$$-2\varepsilon\int_\tau^t e^{-2\varepsilon\int_t^s|y(\theta_r\omega)|dr}(|y(\theta_s\omega)|-y(\theta_s\omega))\|\nabla u(s,\tau,\omega,u_0)\|^2ds$$

$$+2\varepsilon\int_\tau^t e^{-2\varepsilon\int_t^s|y(\theta_r\omega)|dr}y(\theta_s\omega)(f(x,u(s,\tau,\omega,u_0)),u(s,\tau,\omega,u_0))ds$$

$$-4\varepsilon\int_\tau^t e^{-2\varepsilon\int_t^s|y(\theta_r\omega)|dr}|y(\theta_s\omega)|\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}F(x,u(s,\tau,\omega,u_0))dxds$$

$$-2\varepsilon^2\int_\tau^t e^{-2\varepsilon\int_t^s|y(\theta_r\omega)|dr}y^2(\theta_s\omega)(u(s,\tau,\omega,u_0),v(s,\tau,\omega,v_0))ds$$

$$+2\int_\tau^t e^{-2\varepsilon\int_t^s|y(\theta_r\omega)|dr}(g,v(s,\tau,\omega,v_0))ds. \tag{3.67}$$

By (3.64) and (3.67) we obtain

$$\|v(t,\tau,\omega,v_0)\|^2+\lambda\|u(t,\tau,\omega,u_0)\|^2+\|\nabla u(t,\tau,\omega,u_0)\|^2$$

$$=-2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}F(x,u(t,\tau,\omega,u_0))dx$$

$$+e^{-2\varepsilon\int_t^\tau|y(\theta_r\omega)|dr}(\|v_0\|^2+\lambda\|u_0\|^2+\|\nabla u_0\|^2+2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}F(x,u_0)dx)$$

$$-2\int_\tau^t e^{-2\varepsilon\int_t^s|y(\theta_r\omega)|dr}(\alpha+\varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega)|+y(\theta_s\omega)))\|v(s,\tau,\omega,v_0)\|^2ds$$

$$-2\varepsilon\lambda\int_\tau^t e^{-2\varepsilon\int_t^s|y(\theta_r\omega)|dr}(|y(\theta_s\omega)|-y(\theta_s\omega))\|u(s,\tau,\omega,u_0)\|^2ds$$

$$-2\varepsilon\int_\tau^t e^{-2\varepsilon\int_t^s|y(\theta_r\omega)|dr}(|y(\theta_s\omega)|-y(\theta_s\omega))\|\nabla u(s,\tau,\omega,u_0)\|^2ds$$

$$+2\varepsilon\int_\tau^t e^{-2\varepsilon\int_t^s|y(\theta_r\omega)|dr}y(\theta_s\omega)(f(x,u(s,\tau,\omega,u_0)),u(s,\tau,\omega,u_0))ds$$

$$-4\varepsilon\int_\tau^t e^{-2\varepsilon\int_t^s|y(\theta_r\omega)|dr}|y(\theta_s\omega)|\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}F(x,u(s,\tau,\omega,u_0))dxds$$

$$-2\varepsilon^2\int_\tau^t e^{-2\varepsilon\int_t^s|y(\theta_r\omega)|dr}y^2(\theta_s\omega)(u(s,\tau,\omega,u_0),v(s,\tau,\omega,v_0))ds$$

$$+2\int_\tau^t e^{-2\varepsilon\int_t^s|y(\theta_r\omega)|dr}(g,v(s,\tau,\omega,v_0))ds. \tag{3.68}$$

Replacing t by t_n, ω by ω_n, $u_{0,n}$ by u_0, $v_{0,n}$ by v_0 in (3.68), we get

$$\|v(t_n,\tau,\omega_n,v_{0,n})\|^2+\lambda\|u(t_n,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n})\|^2+\|\nabla u(t_n,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n})\|^2$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= -2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x, u(t_n, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n}))dx \\
&+ e^{-2\varepsilon\int_{t_n}^{\tau}|y(\theta_r\omega_n)|dr}(\|v_{0,n}\|^2 + \lambda\|u_{0,n}\|^2 + \|\nabla u_{0,n}\|^2 + 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x, u_{0,n})dx) \\
&-2\int_{\tau}^{t_n} e^{-2\varepsilon\int_{t_n}^{s}|y(\theta_r\omega_n)|dr}(\alpha + \varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega_n)| + y(\theta_s\omega_n)))\|v(s, \tau, \omega_n, v_{0,n})\|^2 ds \\
&-2\varepsilon\lambda\int_{\tau}^{t_n} e^{-2\varepsilon\int_{t_n}^{s}|y(\theta_r\omega_n)|dr}(|y(\theta_s\omega_n)| - y(\theta_s\omega_n))\|u(s, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n})\|^2 ds \\
&-2\varepsilon\int_{\tau}^{t_n} e^{-2\varepsilon\int_{t_n}^{s}|y(\theta_r\omega_n)|dr}(|y(\theta_s\omega_n)| - y(\theta_s\omega_n))\|\nabla u(s, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n})\|^2 ds \\
&+2\varepsilon\int_{\tau}^{t_n} e^{-2\varepsilon\int_{t_n}^{s}|y(\theta_r\omega_n)|dr} y(\theta_s\omega_n)(f(x, u(s, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n})), u(s, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n}))ds \\
&-4\varepsilon\int_{\tau}^{t_n} e^{-2\varepsilon\int_{t_n}^{s}|y(\theta_r\omega_n)|dr}|y(\theta_s\omega_n)|\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x, u(s, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n}))dxds \\
&-2\varepsilon^2\int_{\tau}^{t_n} e^{-2\varepsilon\int_{t_n}^{s}|y(\theta_r\omega_n)|dr} y^2(\theta_s\omega_n)(u(s, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n}), v(s, \tau, \omega_n, v_{0,n}))ds \\
&+ 2\int_{\tau}^{t_n} e^{-2\varepsilon\int_{t_n}^{s}|y(\theta_r\omega_n)|dr}(g, v(s, \tau, \omega_n, v_{0,n}))ds. \qquad (3.69)
\end{aligned}
$$

We need to examine the limit of each term in (3.69). By (3.62) we have for each $r \in [\tau, \tau + T]$,

$$
u(r, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n}) \rightharpoonup u(r, \tau, \omega, u_0) \quad \text{in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^n), \qquad (3.70)
$$

and

$$
v(r, \tau, \omega_n, v_{0,n}) \rightharpoonup v(r, \tau, \omega, v_0) \quad \text{in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^n). \qquad (3.71)
$$

We claim that for every $r \in [\tau, \tau + T]$,

$$
u(r, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n}) \to u(r, \tau, \omega, u_0) \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^n). \qquad (3.72)
$$

Since $(u_{0,n}, v_{0,n}) \to (u_0, v_0)$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\omega_n \to \omega$ with $\omega_n, \omega \in \Omega_m$, by Lemma 3.4 we find that for every $\eta > 0$, there exist $N_1 \geq 1$ and $K \geq 1$ such that for all $n \geq N_1$ and $r \in [\tau, \tau + T]$,

$$
\int_{|x|\geq K} |u(r, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n})|^2 dx \leq \frac{\eta}{8} \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{|x|\geq K} |u(r, \tau, \omega, u_0)|^2 dx \leq \frac{\eta}{8}. \qquad (3.73)
$$

On the other hand, by the compactness of embedding $H^1(B_K) \hookrightarrow L^2(B_K)$ with $B_K = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x| < K\}$, we get from (3.70) that

$$
u(r, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n}) \to u(r, \tau, \omega, u_0) \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(B_K). \qquad (3.74)
$$

By (3.74), there exists $N_2 \geq N_1$ such that for all $n \geq N_2$,

$$\int_{|x|<K} |u(r,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n}) - u(r,\tau,\omega,u_0)|^2 dx \leq \frac{\eta}{2}. \tag{3.75}$$

It follows from (3.73) and (3.75) that for all $n \geq N_2$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(r,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n}) - u(r,\tau,\omega,u_0)|^2 dx \leq \eta,$$

which implies (3.72). Similarly, we also have

$$u(t_n,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n}) \to u(t,\tau,\omega,u_0) \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), \tag{3.76}$$

which follows from (3.63), (3.73) and the arguments of (3.72). By (3.4) and (3.55) we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |F(x,u(t_n,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n})) - F(x,u(t,\tau,\omega,u_0))| dx \\ \leq\ & C(\|u(t_n,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n})\|_{H^1}^{\gamma} + \|u(t,\tau,\omega,u_0)\|_{H^1}^{\gamma} + \|\phi_1\|^2)\|u(t_n,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n}) - u(t,\tau,\omega,u_0)\| \\ &\leq C_1\|u(t_n,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n}) - u(t,\tau,\omega,u_0)\|, \end{aligned}$$

which together with (3.76) yields

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x,u(t_n,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n}))dx \to \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x,u(t,\tau,\omega,u_0))dx. \tag{3.77}$$

Analogously, by $u_{0,n} \to u_0$ we can get

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x,u_{0,n})dx \to \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x,u_0)dx. \tag{3.78}$$

By (3.55), (3.72), Lemma 3.1 (i), the arguments of (3.77) and the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{\tau}^{t_n} e^{-2\varepsilon \int_{t_n}^{s} |y(\theta_r\omega_n)|dr} y(\theta_s\omega_n) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x,u(s,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n}))dxds \\ &= \int_{\tau}^{t} e^{-2\varepsilon \int_{t}^{s} |y(\theta_r\omega)|dr} y(\theta_s\omega) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x,u(s,\tau,\omega,u_0))dxds. \end{aligned} \tag{3.79}$$

By (3.4) we have for all $s \in [\tau,\tau+T]$,

$$|f(x,u(s,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n}))u(s,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n})| \leq c_1|u(s,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n})|^{\gamma+1} + |\phi_1||u(s,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n})|. \tag{3.80}$$

By (3.55) and (3.72) we see that the right-hand side of (3.80) is convergent in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Thus by a dominated convergence theorem in [4] we obtain

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x,u(s,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n}))u(s,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n})dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x,u(s,\tau,\omega,u_0))u(s,\tau,\omega,u_0)dx. \tag{3.81}$$

By (3.55), Lemma 3.1 (i) and the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, we obtain from (3.81) that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_\tau^{t_n} e^{-2\varepsilon\int_{t_n}^s |y(\theta_r\omega_n)|dr} y(\theta_s\omega_n)(f(x,u(s,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n})),u(s,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n}))ds$$
$$= \int_\tau^{t} e^{-2\varepsilon\int_{t}^s |y(\theta_r\omega)|dr} y(\theta_s\omega)(f(x,u(s,\tau,\omega,u_{0})),u(s,\tau,\omega,u_{0}))ds. \tag{3.82}$$

We now deal with the third term on the right-hand side of (3.69). Note that

$$\int_\tau^{t_n} e^{-2\varepsilon\int_{t_n}^s |y(\theta_r\omega_n)|dr}(\alpha+\varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega_n)|+y(\theta_s\omega_n)))\|v(s,\tau,\omega_n,v_{0,n})\|^2ds$$
$$= e^{-2\varepsilon\int_{t_n}^t |y(\theta_r\omega_n)|dr}\int_\tau^{t} e^{-2\varepsilon\int_{t}^s |y(\theta_r\omega_n)|dr}(\alpha+\varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega_n)|+y(\theta_s\omega_n)))\|v(s,\tau,\omega_n,v_{0,n})\|^2ds$$
$$+ e^{-2\varepsilon\int_{t_n}^t |y(\theta_r\omega_n)|dr}\int_t^{t_n} e^{-2\varepsilon\int_{t}^s |y(\theta_r\omega_n)|dr}(\alpha+\varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega_n)|+y(\theta_s\omega_n)))\|v(s,\tau,\omega_n,v_{0,n})\|^2ds. \tag{3.83}$$

Since $\omega_n\to\omega$ and $t_n\to t$, by (3.34) and (3.55) we get

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} e^{-2\varepsilon\int_{t_n}^t |y(\theta_r\omega_n)|dr} = 1, \tag{3.84}$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_t^{t_n} e^{-2\varepsilon\int_{t}^s |y(\theta_r\omega_n)|dr}(\alpha+\varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega_n)|+y(\theta_s\omega_n)))\|v(s,\tau,\omega_n,v_{0,n})\|^2ds = 0. \tag{3.85}$$

On the other hand, by Fatou's Theorem and Lemma 3.1 (i), we have

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\int_\tau^{t} e^{-2\varepsilon\int_{t}^s |y(\theta_r\omega_n)|dr}(\alpha+\varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega_n)|+y(\theta_s\omega_n)))\|v(s,\tau,\omega_n,v_{0,n})\|^2ds$$
$$\ge \int_\tau^{t} \liminf_{n\to\infty}(e^{-2\varepsilon\int_{t}^s |y(\theta_r\omega_n)|dr}(\alpha+\varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega_n)|+y(\theta_s\omega_n)))\|v(s,\tau,\omega_n,v_{0,n})\|^2)ds$$
$$\ge \int_\tau^{t} e^{-2\varepsilon\int_{t}^s |y(\theta_r\omega)|dr}(\alpha+\varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega)|+y(\theta_s\omega)))\liminf_{n\to\infty}\|v(s,\tau,\omega_n,v_{0,n})\|^2ds. \tag{3.86}$$

Since $v(s,\tau,\omega_n,v_{0,n})\rightharpoonup v(s,\tau,\omega,v_0)$ by (3.71), we get from (3.86) that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\int_\tau^{t} e^{-2\varepsilon\int_{t}^s |y(\theta_r\omega_n)|dr}(\alpha+\varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega_n)|+y(\theta_s\omega_n)))\|v(s,\tau,\omega_n,v_{0,n})\|^2ds$$
$$\ge \int_\tau^{t} e^{-2\varepsilon\int_{t}^s |y(\theta_r\omega)|dr}(\alpha+\varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega)|+y(\theta_s\omega)))\|v(s,\tau,\omega,v_{0})\|^2ds. \tag{3.87}$$

It follows from (3.83)-(3.85) and (3.87) that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\int_\tau^{t_n} e^{-2\varepsilon\int_{t_n}^s |y(\theta_r\omega_n)|dr}(\alpha+\varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega_n)|+y(\theta_s\omega_n)))\|v(s,\tau,\omega_n,v_{0,n})\|^2ds$$

$$\geq \int_\tau^t e^{-2\varepsilon \int_t^s |y(\theta_r\omega)|dr}(\alpha + \varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega)| + y(\theta_s\omega)))\|v(s,\tau,\omega,v_0)\|^2 ds. \tag{3.88}$$

By similar arguments, we can also obtain

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_\tau^{t_n} e^{-2\varepsilon \int_{t_n}^s |y(\theta_r\omega_n)|dr}(|y(\theta_s\omega_n)| + y(\theta_s\omega_n))\|\nabla u(s,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n})\|^2 ds$$

$$\geq \int_\tau^t e^{-2\varepsilon \int_t^s |y(\theta_r\omega)|dr}(|y(\theta_s\omega)| + y(\theta_s\omega))\|\nabla u(s,\tau,\omega,u_0)\|^2 ds. \tag{3.89}$$

Now taking the limit superior of (3.69) as $n \to \infty$, since $(u_{0,n}, v_{0,n}) \to (u_0, v_0)$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, by Lemma 3.1 (i), (3.55), (3.71)-(3.72), (3.77)-(3), (3) and (3.88)-(3.89), we get

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \left(\|v(t_n,\tau,\omega_n,v_{0,n})\|^2 + \lambda\|u(t_n,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n})\|^2 + \|\nabla u(t_n,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n})\|^2\right)$$

$$\leq -2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x,u(t,\tau,\omega,u_0))dx$$

$$+e^{-2\varepsilon \int_t^\tau |y(\theta_r\omega)|dr}(\|v_0\|^2 + \lambda\|u_0\|^2 + \|\nabla u_0\|^2 + 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x,u_0)dx)$$

$$-2\int_\tau^t e^{-2\varepsilon \int_t^s |y(\theta_r\omega)|dr}(\alpha + \varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega)| + y(\theta_s\omega)))\|v(s,\tau,\omega,v_0)\|^2 ds$$

$$-2\varepsilon\lambda \int_\tau^t e^{-2\varepsilon \int_t^s |y(\theta_r\omega)|dr}(|y(\theta_s\omega)| - y(\theta_s\omega))\|u(s,\tau,\omega,u_0)\|^2 ds$$

$$-2\varepsilon \int_\tau^t e^{-2\varepsilon \int_t^s |y(\theta_r\omega)|dr}(|y(\theta_s\omega)| - y(\theta_s\omega))\|\nabla u(s,\tau,\omega,u_0)\|^2 ds$$

$$+2\varepsilon \int_\tau^t e^{-2\varepsilon \int_t^s |y(\theta_r\omega)|dr} y(\theta_s\omega)(f(x,u(s,\tau,\omega,u_0)), u(s,\tau,\omega,u_0))ds$$

$$-4\varepsilon \int_\tau^t e^{-2\varepsilon \int_t^s |y(\theta_r\omega)|dr} y(\theta_s\omega)\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x,u(s,\tau,\omega,u_0))dxds$$

$$-2\varepsilon^2 \int_\tau^t e^{-2\varepsilon \int_t^s |y(\theta_r\omega)|dr} y^2(\theta_s\omega)(u(s,\tau,\omega,u_0), v(s,\tau,\omega,v_0))ds$$

$$+ 2\int_\tau^t e^{-2\varepsilon \int_t^s |y(\theta_r\omega)|dr}(g, v(s,\tau,\omega,v_0))ds. \tag{3.90}$$

Note that the right-hand side of (3.90) is exactly the same as that of (3.68). Thus we obtain

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \left(\|v(t_n,\tau,\omega_n,v_{0,n})\|^2 + \lambda\|u(t_n,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n})\|^2 + \|\nabla u(t_n,\tau,\omega_n,u_{0,n})\|^2\right)$$

$$\leq \|v(t,\tau,\omega,v_0)\|^2 + \lambda\|u(t,\tau,\omega,u_0)\|^2 + \|\nabla u(t,\tau,\omega,u_0)\|^2. \tag{3.91}$$

On the other hand, since the right-hand side of (3.91) is equivalent to the norm of (u, v) in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, by (3.70)-(3.71) we have

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \left(\|v(t_n, \tau, \omega_n, v_{0,n})\|^2 + \lambda\|u(t_n, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n})\|^2 + \|\nabla u(t_n, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n})\|^2\right)$$

$$\geq \|v(t, \tau, \omega, v_0)\|^2 + \lambda\|u(t, \tau, \omega, u_0)\|^2 + \|\nabla u(t, \tau, \omega, u_0)\|^2. \tag{3.92}$$

It follows from (3.91)-(3.92) that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left(\|v(t_n, \tau, \omega_n, v_{0,n})\|^2 + \lambda\|u(t_n, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n})\|^2 + \|\nabla u(t_n, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n})\|^2\right)$$

$$= \|v(t, \tau, \omega, v_0)\|^2 + \lambda\|u(t, \tau, \omega, u_0)\|^2 + \|\nabla u(t, \tau, \omega, u_0)\|^2$$

which along with (3.70)-(3.71) implies

$$(u(t_n, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n}), v(t_n, \tau, \omega_n, v_{0,n})) \to (u(t, \tau, \omega, u_0), v(t, \tau, \omega, v_0)) \quad \text{in} \quad H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

as desired. ☐

As an immediate consequence of Lemma 3.5, we get the following weak continuity of solutions of (3.9)-(3.11) which is useful for proving the asymptotic compactness of solutions later.

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose* (3.4)-(3.6) *hold,* $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ *and* $\omega \in \Omega$. *Let* $(u(\cdot, \tau, \omega, u_{0,n}), v(\cdot, \tau, \omega, v_{0,n}))$ *be a solution of* (3.9)-(3.11) *with initial data* $(u_{0,n}, v_{0,n})$ *at initial time* τ. *If* $(u_{0,n}, v_{0,n}) \rightharpoonup (u_0, v_0)$ *in* $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, *then system* (3.9)-(3.11) *has a solution* $(u, v) = (u(\cdot, \tau, \omega, u_0), v(\cdot, \tau, \omega, v_0))$ *with initial condition* (u_0, v_0) *at initial time* τ *such that, up to a subsequence, for all* $t \geq \tau$,

$$u(t, \tau, \omega, u_{0,n}) \rightharpoonup u(t, \tau, \omega, u_0) \text{ in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

and

$$v(t, \tau, \omega, v_{0,n}) \rightharpoonup v(t, \tau, \omega, v_0) \text{ in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Proof. Given $\omega \in \Omega$, since $\Omega = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \Omega_m$ by Lemma 3.1, we find that there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\omega \in \Omega_m$. Then the result follows from Lemma 3.5 (i) for $t_n = t$ and $\omega_n = \omega$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. ☐

In the sequel, we write $(U(t + \tau, \tau, \omega, u_0), Z(t + \tau, \tau, \omega, z_0))$ for the collection of all solutions of (3.1)-(3.3) at time $t + \tau$ with initial condition (u_0, z_0) and initial time τ; that is,

$$(U(t + \tau, \tau, \omega, u_0), Z(t + \tau, \tau, \omega, z_0))$$

$$= \left\{(u(t + \tau, \tau, \omega, u_0), z(t + \tau, \tau, \omega, z_0)) : (u, z) \text{ is a solution of (3.1)-(3.3)}\right\}.$$

For the measurability of (U, Z), we have the following result.

Lemma 3.7. *Suppose* (3.4)-(3.6) *hold and* $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$. *Then the multivalued mapping*

$$(U(\cdot, \tau, \cdot, \cdot), Z(\cdot, \tau, \cdot, \cdot)) : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \Omega \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \to 2^{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}$$

is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^+) \times \mathcal{B}(\Omega) \times \mathcal{B}(H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$.

Proof. We first show $(U(\cdot, \tau, \cdot, \cdot), Z(\cdot, \tau, \cdot, \cdot))$: $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \Omega_m \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \to 2^{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ is weakly upper semicontinuous for every fixed $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose $t_n \to t$ with $t_n \geq 0$, $\omega_n \to \omega$ with $\omega_n, \omega \in \Omega_m$, and $(u_{0,n}, z_{0,n}) \to (u_0, z_0)$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Let $(u(t, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n}), z(t, \tau, \omega_n, z_{0,n}))$ be a solution of (3.1)-(3.3) with initial condition $(u_{0,n}, z_{0,n})$ at τ. By (3.12), $(u(t, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n}), v(t, \tau, \omega_n, v_{0,n}))$ is a solution of (3.9)-(3.11) with initial condition $(u_{0,n}, v_{0,n})$ at τ, where

$$v(t, \tau, \omega_n, v_{0,n}) = z(t, \tau, \omega_n, z_{0,n}) - \varepsilon y(\theta_t \omega_n) u(t, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n}) \text{ and } v_{0,n} = z_{0,n} - \varepsilon y(\theta_\tau \omega_n) u_{0,n}. \quad (3.93)$$

Let $v_0 = z_0 - \varepsilon y(\theta_\tau \omega) u_0$. Since $(u_{0,n}, z_{0,n}) \to (u_0, z_0)$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we get $(u_{0,n}, v_{0,n}) \to (u_0, v_0)$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. By Lemma 3.5 (i), we find that system (3.9)-(3.11) has a solution $(u(\cdot, \tau, \omega, u_0), v(\cdot, \tau, \omega, v_0))$ with initial data (u_0, v_0) at τ such that, up to a subsequence,

$$(u(t_n, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n}), v(t_n, \tau, \omega_n, v_{0,n})) \rightharpoonup (u(t, \tau, \omega, u_0), v(t, \tau, \omega, v_0)) \quad (3.94)$$

in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. By (3.55), (3.93)-(3.94) and Lemma 3.1 (i), we obtain

$$z(t_n, \tau, \omega_n, z_{0,n}) \rightharpoonup v(t, \tau, \omega, v_0) + \varepsilon y(\theta_t \omega) u(t, \tau, \omega, u_0) = z(t, \tau, \omega, z_0) \quad (3.95)$$

where the last equality follows from (3.12). By (3.94)-(3.95) we have

$$(u(t_n, \tau, \omega_n, u_{0,n}), z(t_n, \tau, \omega_n, z_{0,n})) \rightharpoonup (u(t, \tau, \omega, u_0), z(t, \tau, \omega, z_0)) \quad (3.96)$$

in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Note that (3.96) implies the weak upper semicontinuity of $(U(\cdot, \tau, \cdot, \cdot), Z(\cdot, \tau, \cdot, \cdot))$: $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \Omega_m \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \to 2^{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}$, and thus by Lemma 2.5 it is measurable as a multi-valued mapping from $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \Omega_m \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $2^{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ with respect to $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^+) \times \mathcal{B}(\Omega_m) \times \mathcal{B}(H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$. Since $\Omega = \bigcup\limits_{m=1}^{\infty} \Omega_m$ and Ω_m is measurable by Lemma 3.1, we find that the mapping $(U(\cdot, \tau, \cdot, \cdot), V(\cdot, \tau, \cdot, \cdot))$ from $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \Omega \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $2^{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^+) \times \mathcal{B}(\Omega) \times \mathcal{B}(H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n))$. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 3.8. *Suppose* (3.4)-(3.6) *hold. Then for every* $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$ *and* $(u_0, v_0) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, *the set* $(U(t + \tau, \tau, \omega, u_0), Z(t + \tau, \tau, \omega, z_0))$ *is closed in* $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Proof. Let $(\widetilde{u}_n, \widetilde{z}_n) \in (U(t+\tau, \tau, \omega, u_0), Z(t+\tau, \tau, \omega, z_0))$ and $(\widetilde{u}, \widetilde{z}) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $(\widetilde{u}_n, \widetilde{z}_n) \to (\widetilde{u}, \widetilde{z})$. We will prove $(\widetilde{u}, \widetilde{z}) \in (U(t+\tau, \tau, \omega, u_0), Z(t+\tau, \tau, \omega, z_0))$. Since $(\widetilde{u}_n, \widetilde{z}_n) \in (U(t+\tau, \tau, \omega, u_0), Z(t+\tau, \tau, \omega, z_0))$, there exists $(u_n(\cdot, \tau, \omega, u_0), z_n(\cdot, \tau, \omega, z_0))$ such that

$$(\widetilde{u}_n, \widetilde{z}_n) = (u_n(t+\tau, \tau, \omega, u_0), z_n(t+\tau, \tau, \omega, z_0)). \tag{3.97}$$

By (3.12) and (3.97) we have

$$(\widetilde{u}_n, \widetilde{z}_n) = (u_n(t+\tau, \tau, \omega, u_0), v_n(t+\tau, \tau, \omega, v_0) + \varepsilon y(\theta_{t+\tau}\omega) u_n(t+\tau, \tau, \omega, u_0)) \tag{3.98}$$

with $v_0 = z_0 - \varepsilon y(\theta_\tau \omega) u_0$. For given ω, by Lemma 3.1, there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\omega \in \Omega_m$. Then applying Lemma 3.5 (i) to $(u_n(\cdot, \tau, \omega, u_0), v_n(\cdot, \tau, \omega, v_0))$ with $t_n = t+\tau$, $\omega_n = \omega$, $u_{0,n} = u_0$ and $v_{0,n} = v_0$ we find that system (3.9)-(3.11) has a solution $(u(\cdot, \tau, \omega, u_0), v(\cdot, \tau, \omega, v_0))$ with initial condition (u_0, v_0) at initial time τ such that, up to a subsequence,

$$u_n(t+\tau, \tau, \omega, u_0) \rightharpoonup u(t+\tau, \tau, \omega, u_0) \text{ in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$$

and

$$v_n(t+\tau, \tau, \omega, v_0) \rightharpoonup v(t, \tau, \omega, v_0) \text{ in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^n),$$

which together with (3.98) and (3.12) implies

$$(\widetilde{u}_n, \widetilde{z}_n) \rightharpoonup (u(t+\tau, \tau, \omega, u_0), z(t+\tau, \tau, \omega, z_0)) \;\text{ in }\; H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n). \tag{3.99}$$

Since $(\widetilde{u}_n, \widetilde{z}_n) \to (\widetilde{u}, \widetilde{z})$ strongly in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, by (3.99) we get

$$(\widetilde{u}, \widetilde{z}) = (u(t+\tau, \tau, \omega, u_0), z(t+\tau, \tau, \omega, z_0)) \in (U(t+\tau, \tau, \omega, u_0), Z(t+\tau, \tau, \omega, z_0))$$

as desired. □

We are now ready to define a multi-valued non-autonomous random dynamical system for problem (3.1)-(3.3). Let Φ: $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \to 2^{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ be a multi-valued mapping given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(t, \tau, \omega, (u_0, z_0)) &= (U(t+\tau, \tau, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_0), Z(t+\tau, \tau, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, z_0)) \\ &= \{(u(t+\tau, \tau, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_0), z(t+\tau, \tau, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, z_0)) : \ (u, z) \text{ is a solution of (3.1)-(3.3) } \} \end{aligned} \tag{3.100}$$

for every $(t, \tau, \omega, (u_0, z_0)) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R} \times \Omega \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Since $\theta_{-\tau} : \Omega \to \Omega$ is measurable, by Lemma 3.7 we infer that for every $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $\Phi(\cdot, \tau, \cdot, \cdot)$: $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \Omega \times H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \to 2^{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ is measurable. It is clear that Φ satisfies (ii) and (iii) of Definition 2.4. Therefore, by Lemma 3.8, Φ is a multivalued non-autonomous cocycle in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. In addition, by Lemma 3.5 (ii) we find the following upper semicontinuity of Φ which is needed for construction of random attractors.

Lemma 3.9. *Suppose* (3.4)-(3.6) *hold. Then for every* $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$*,* $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ *and* $\omega \in \Omega$*, the mapping* $\Phi(t, \tau, \omega, \cdot)$*:* $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \to 2^{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ *is upper semicontinuous.*

Proof. This follows directly from Lemma 3.5 (ii) and Lemma 2.1. □

By (3.12) we have

$$z(t+\tau, \tau, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, z_0) = v(t+\tau, \tau, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, v_0) + \varepsilon y(\theta_t\omega) u(t+\tau, \tau, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_0) \tag{3.101}$$

with $v_0 = z_0 - \varepsilon y(\omega) u_0$. It is worth noticing that for each $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Phi(t, \tau - t, \theta_{-t}\omega, (u_0, z_0)) \\
&= \{(u(\tau, \tau - t, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_0), z(\tau, \tau - t, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, z_0)) : \ (u, z) \text{ is a solution of (3.1)-(3.3)}\} \\
&= \{(u(\tau, \tau - t, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_0), v(\tau, \tau - t, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, v_0) + \varepsilon y(\omega) u(\tau, \tau - t, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_0)) : (u, v) \text{ is a solution of (3.9)-(3.11)}\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.102}$$

In the rest of the paper, we will investigate the pullback asymptotic behavior of Φ. From now on, we fix a small positive number δ such that

$$\alpha - \delta > 0, \quad \lambda + \delta^2 - \alpha\delta > 0, \tag{3.103}$$

and put

$$\sigma = \min\left\{\frac{\delta}{2}, \ \frac{\alpha - \delta}{4}, \ \frac{\delta c_2}{4}\right\}, \tag{3.104}$$

where c_2 is the positive constant in (3.5). From now on, we assume g satisfies

$$\int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{\frac{1}{2\gamma+2}\sigma s} \|g(s+\tau, \cdot)\|^2 ds < \infty, \quad \text{for all} \ \ \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{3.105}$$

where γ is the number in (3.4).

As usual, for a bounded nonempty subset B of $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, the distance between B and the origin is written as $\|B\| = \sup\limits_{\phi \in B} \|\phi\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}$. In the next section, we will prove Φ has a $\mathcal{D}$-pullback random attractor where $\mathcal{D} = \{D = \{D(\tau, \omega) : \tau \in \mathbb{R}, \omega \in \Omega\}\}$ is the collection of all families of bounded nonempty subsets of $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that for every $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\lim_{s \to \infty} e^{-\sigma s} \|D(\tau - s, \theta_{-s}\omega)\|^{\gamma+1} = 0.$$

4 Asymptotic compactness of solutions

In this section, we derive uniform estimates of system (3.9)-(3.11) and establish the pullback asymptotic compactness of solutions. We first provide the uniform estimates in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Lemma 4.1. *Assume that* (3.4)-(3.6) *and* (3.105) *hold. Let* $\tau\in\mathbb{R}$, $\omega\in\Omega$ *and* $D=\{D(\tau,\omega):\tau\in\mathbb{R},\omega\in\Omega\}\in\mathcal{D}$. *Then there exist* $\varepsilon_0=\varepsilon_0(\alpha,\lambda,f)\in(0,1)$ *and* $T=T(\tau,\omega,D)>0$ *such that for all* $\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_0]$, $t\geq T$ *and* $s\in[-t,0]$, *the solution* (u,v) *of problem* (3.9)-(3.11) *satisfies*

$$\|u(\tau+s,\tau-t,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_0)\|^2_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}+\|v(\tau+s,\tau-t,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_0)\|^2$$

$$+\|u(\tau+s,\tau-t,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_0)\|^{\gamma+1}_{L^{\gamma+1}(\mathbb{R}^n)}$$

$$+\int_{\tau-t}^{\tau+s}e^{\int_{\tau+s}^{\xi}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_{r-\tau}\omega)|^2)dr}\left(\|u(\xi,\tau-t,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_0)\|^2_{H^1}+\|v(\xi,\tau-t,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_0)\|^2\right)d\xi$$

$$\leq M+e^{\int_s^0(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr}R(\tau,\omega),$$

where $(u_0,z_0)\in D(\tau-t,\theta_{-t}\omega)$ *and* $v_0=z_0-\varepsilon y(\omega)u_0$, M *and* c *are positive constants independent of* τ, ω, D *and* ε, *and* $R(\tau,\cdot)$ *is a random variable.*

Proof. This lemma can be proved by energy equation (3.13). The details are quite similar to the proof Lemma 4.2 in [46] with minor changes, and hence are omitted here. □

The next estimate is an improvement of Lemma 4.3 in [46] on the tails of solutions outside a bounded domains when time is sufficiently large.

Lemma 4.2. *Assume that* (3.4)-(3.6) *and* (3.105) *hold. Let* $\eta>0$, $\tau\in\mathbb{R}$, $\omega\in\Omega$ *and* $D=\{D(\tau,\omega):\tau\in\mathbb{R},\omega\in\Omega\}\in\mathcal{D}$. *Then there exist* $\varepsilon_0=\varepsilon_0(\alpha,\lambda,f)\in(0,1)$, $T=T(\tau,\omega,D,\eta)>0$ *and* $K=K(\tau,\omega,\eta)\geq1$ *such that for all* $\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_0]$, $t\geq T$ *and* $s\in[-t,0]$, *the solution* (u,v) *of problem* (3.9)-(3.11) *satisfies*

$$\int_{|x|\geq K}\left(|u(\tau+s,\tau-t,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_0)|^2+|\nabla u(\tau+s,\tau-t,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_0)|^2+|v(\tau+s,\tau-t,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_0)|^2\right)dx$$

$$\leq\eta+\eta e^{\int_s^0(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr},$$

where $(u_0,z_0)\in D(\tau-t,\theta_{-t}\omega)$ *and* $v_0=z_0-\varepsilon y(\omega)u_0$.

Proof. Let ρ be the smooth cut-off function given by (3.41). Taking the inner product of (3.10) with $\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right) v$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, by (3.4)-(3.6) and (3.9), after some calculations, we obtain the following inequality (see Lemma 4.3 in [46] for more details).

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)\left(|v|^2+(\lambda+\delta^2-\alpha\delta)|u|^2+|\nabla u|^2+2F(x,u)\right)dx\\
&+(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_t\omega)|^2)\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)\left(|v|^2+(\lambda+\delta^2-\alpha\delta)|u|^2+|\nabla u|^2+2F(x,u)\right)dx\\
&\leq \frac{c}{k}\left(\|\nabla u\|^2+\|v\|^2\right)+c\int_{|x|\geq k}\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)|g|^2dx\\
&+\varepsilon c(1+|y(\theta_t\omega)|^2)\int_{|x|\geq k}\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)(|\phi_1|^2+|\phi_2|+|\phi_3|)dx.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.1}$$

By (4.1), for every $\eta>0$, there exists $K_1=K_1(\eta)\geq 1$ such that for all $k\geq K_1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)\left(|v|^2+(\lambda+\delta^2-\alpha\delta)|u|^2+|\nabla u|^2+2F(x,u)\right)dx\\
&+(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_t\omega)|^2)\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)\left(|v|^2+(\lambda+\delta^2-\alpha\delta)|u|^2+|\nabla u|^2+2F(x,u)\right)dx\\
&\leq \eta\left(1+\|\nabla u\|^2+\|v\|^2\right)+\varepsilon\eta(1+|y(\theta_t\omega)|^2)+c\int_{|x|\geq k}|g(t,x)|^2dx.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.2}$$

Multiplying (4.2) by $e^{\int_0^t(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr}$ and then integrating on $(\tau-t,\tau+s)$ with $t\geq 0$ and $s\in[-t,0]$, we get for all $k\geq K_1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)\left(|v(\tau+s,\tau-t,\omega,v_0)|^2+(\lambda+\delta^2-\alpha\delta)|u(\tau+s,\tau-t,\omega,u_0)|^2\right)dx\\
&+\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)\left(|\nabla u(\tau+s,\tau-t,\omega,u_0)|^2+2F(x,u(\tau+s,\tau-t,\omega,u_0))\right)dx\\
&\leq e^{\int_{\tau+s}^{\tau-t}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)\left(|v_0(x)|^2+(\lambda+\delta^2-\alpha\delta)|u_0(x)|^2\right)dx\\
&+e^{\int_{\tau+s}^{\tau-t}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)\left(|\nabla u_0(x)|^2+2F(x,u_0(x))\right)dx\\
&+\eta\int_{\tau-t}^{\tau+s}e^{\int_{\tau+s}^{\xi}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr}\left(1+\|\nabla u(\xi,\tau-t,\omega,u_0)\|^2+\|v(\xi,\tau-t,\omega,v_0)\|^2\right)d\xi\\
&+\varepsilon\eta\int_{\tau-t}^{\tau+s}e^{\int_{\tau+s}^{\xi}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr}\left(1+|y(\theta_\xi\omega)|^2\right)d\xi
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ c\int_{\tau-t}^{\tau+s} e^{\int_{\tau+s}^{\xi}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr}\int_{|x|\geq k}|g(\xi,x)|^2dxd\xi. \tag{4.3}$$

Replacing ω by $\theta_{-\tau}\omega$ in (4.3) we get, for all $t \geq 0$, $s \in [-t, 0]$ and $k \geq K_1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)\left(|v(\tau+s,\tau-t,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_0)|^2+(\lambda+\delta^2-\alpha\delta)|u(\tau+s,\tau-t,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_0)|^2\right)dx\\
&+\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)\left(|\nabla u(\tau+s,\tau-t,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_0)|^2+2F(x,u(\tau+s,\tau-t,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_0))\right)dx\\
&\leq e^{\int_{\tau+s}^{\tau-t}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_{r-\tau}\omega)|^2)dr}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)\left(|v_0(x)|^2+(\lambda+\delta^2-\alpha\delta)|u_0(x)|^2\right)dx\\
&\quad+e^{\int_{\tau+s}^{\tau-t}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_{r-\tau}\omega)|^2)dr}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)\left(|\nabla u_0(x)|^2+2F(x,u_0(x))\right)dx\\
&+\eta\int_{\tau-t}^{\tau+s}e^{\int_{\tau+s}^{\xi}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_{r-\tau}\omega)|^2)dr}\left(1+\|\nabla u(\xi,\tau-t,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_0)\|^2+\|v(\xi,\tau-t,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_0)\|^2\right)d\xi\\
&\quad+\varepsilon\eta\int_{\tau-t}^{\tau+s}e^{\int_{\tau+s}^{\xi}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_{r-\tau}\omega)|^2)dr}\left(1+|y(\theta_{\xi-\tau}\omega)|^2\right)d\xi\\
&\quad+c\int_{\tau-t}^{\tau+s}e^{\int_{\tau+s}^{\xi}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_{r-\tau}\omega)|^2)dr}\int_{|x|\geq k}|g(\xi,x)|^2dxd\xi\\
&\leq e^{\int_{s}^{-t}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)\left(|v_0(x)|^2+(\lambda+\delta^2-\alpha\delta)|u_0(x)|^2\right)dx\\
&\quad+e^{\int_{s}^{-t}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)\left(|\nabla u_0(x)|^2+2F(x,u_0(x))\right)dx\\
&+\eta\int_{\tau-t}^{\tau+s}e^{\int_{\tau+s}^{\xi}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_{r-\tau}\omega)|^2)dr}\left(\|\nabla u(\xi,\tau-t,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_0)\|^2+\|v(\xi,\tau-t,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_0)\|^2\right)d\xi\\
&\quad+(1+\varepsilon)\eta\int_{-t}^{s}e^{\int_{s}^{\xi}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr}\left(1+|y(\theta_\xi\omega)|^2\right)d\xi\\
&\quad+c\int_{-t}^{s}e^{\int_{s}^{\xi}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr}\int_{|x|\geq k}|g(\xi+\tau,x)|^2dxd\xi\\
&\leq Ce^{\int_{s}^{-t}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\left(\|v_0\|^2+\|u_0\|^2_{H^1}+\|u_0\|^{\gamma+1}_{H^1}\right)dx\\
&+\eta\int_{\tau-t}^{\tau+s}e^{\int_{\tau+s}^{\xi}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_{r-\tau}\omega)|^2)dr}\left(\|\nabla u(\xi,\tau-t,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_0)\|^2+\|v(\xi,\tau-t,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_0)\|^2\right)d\xi\\
&\quad+(1+\varepsilon)\eta\int_{-\infty}^{0}e^{\int_{s}^{\xi}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr}\left(1+|y(\theta_\xi\omega)|^2\right)d\xi
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+c\int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{\int_s^{\xi}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr}\int_{|x|\geq k}|g(\xi+\tau,x)|^2dxd\xi\\
&\leq C_1 e^{\int_s^{0}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr}e^{\int_0^{-t}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr}(1+\|D(\tau-t,\theta_{-t}\omega)\|^{\gamma+1})\\
&+\eta\int_{\tau-t}^{\tau+s} e^{\int_{\tau+s}^{\xi}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_{r-\tau}\omega)|^2)dr}\left(\|\nabla u(\xi,\tau-t,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_0)\|^2+\|v(\xi,\tau-t,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_0)\|^2\right)d\xi\\
&+(1+\varepsilon)\eta e^{\int_s^{0}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr}\int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{\int_0^{\xi}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr}\left(1+|y(\theta_\xi\omega)|^2\right)d\xi\\
&+ce^{\int_s^{0}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr}\int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{\int_0^{\xi}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr}\int_{|x|\geq k}|g(\xi+\tau,x)|^2dxd\xi. \qquad (4.4)
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that

$$
\lim_{t\to\infty}\frac{1}{t}\int_{-t}^{0}|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2dr=E(y^2)=\frac{1}{2\alpha}.
$$

Therefore, there exists $T=T(\omega)>0$ such that for all $t\geq T$,

$$
\frac{1}{t}\int_{-t}^{0}|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2dr\leq\frac{1}{\alpha}. \qquad (4.5)
$$

Let $\varepsilon_1=\frac{\alpha\sigma}{c(1+\alpha)}$. Then by (4.5) we get, for all $\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_1)$ and $t\geq T$,

$$
e^{\int_0^{-t}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr}\leq e^{-\sigma t}. \qquad (4.6)
$$

Since $D\in\mathcal{D}$, by (4.6) we have for all $\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_1)$,

$$
\lim_{t\to\infty}e^{\int_0^{-t}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr}(1+\|D(\tau-t,\theta_{-t}\omega)\|^{\gamma+1})=0. \qquad (4.7)
$$

By (4.6) and (3.105) we find

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{0}e^{\int_0^{\xi}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}|g(\xi+\tau,x)|^2dxd\xi<\infty, \qquad (4.8)
$$

and

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{0}e^{\int_0^{\xi}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr}\left(1+|y(\theta_\xi\omega)|^2\right)d\xi<\infty. \qquad (4.9)
$$

Notice that (4.8) implies

$$
\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{-\infty}^{0}e^{\int_0^{\xi}(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr}\int_{|x|\geq k}|g(\xi+\tau,x)|^2dxd\xi=0 \qquad (4.10)
$$

By (4.4), (4.7), (4.9)-(4.10) and Lemma 4.1, we infer that there exist $K_2\geq K_1$ and $T_1\geq T$ such that for all $t\geq T_1$, $s\in[-t,0]$, $\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_1)$, and $k\geq K_1$,

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)\left(|v(\tau+s,\tau-t,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_0)|^2+(\lambda+\delta^2-\alpha\delta)|u(\tau+s,\tau-t,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_0)|^2\right)dx
$$

$$+\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)\left(|\nabla u(\tau+s,\tau-t,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_0)|^2+2F(x,u(\tau+s,\tau-t,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_0))\right)dx$$

$$\le C_2\eta+C_2\eta e^{\int_s^0(2\sigma-\varepsilon c-\varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr}. \tag{4.11}$$

Note that $\rho\left(\frac{|x|^2}{k^2}\right)=1$ for $|x|\ge\sqrt{2}k$, which together with (3.6) and (4.11) completes the proof. $\square$

Next, we prove the asymptotic compactness of solutions of (3.9)-(3.11) by the energy equation (3.13). To this end, we set for $(u,v)\in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$E(u,v)=\|v\|^2+(\lambda+\delta^2-\alpha\delta)\|u\|^2+\|\nabla u\|^2+2\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}F(x,u)dx. \tag{4.12}$$

By (3.13) we get

$$\frac{dE}{dt}+(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_t\omega)|)E(u,v)=G(u,v), \tag{4.13}$$

where $G(u,v)$ is give by

$$\begin{aligned}G(u(t,\tau,\omega,u_0),v(t,\tau,\omega,v_0))&=-2\left(\alpha-\delta-2\sigma+\varepsilon(|y(\theta_t\omega)|+y(\theta_t\omega))\right)\|v\|^2\\&-2(\lambda+\delta^2-\alpha\delta)(\delta-2\sigma+\varepsilon(|y(\theta_t\omega)|-y(\theta_t\omega)))\|u\|^2\\&-2(\delta-2\sigma+\varepsilon(|y(\theta_t\omega)|-y(\theta_t\omega)))\|\nabla u\|^2+2(g,v)\\&-2\varepsilon(\varepsilon y(\theta_t\omega)-2\delta)y(\theta_t\omega)(u,v)+2(\varepsilon y(\theta_t\omega)-\delta)(f(x,u),u)\\&+4(2\sigma-\varepsilon|y(\theta_t\omega)|)\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}F(x,u)dx.\end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

Multiplying (4.13) by $e^{\int_0^t(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr}$ and then solving for $E(u,v)$, we obtain, for $\tau\in\mathbb{R}$, $t\ge\tau$ and $\omega\in\Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned}E(u(t,\tau,\omega,u_0),v(t,\tau,\omega,v_0))&=e^{\int_t^\tau(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr}E(u_0,v_0)\\&+\int_\tau^t e^{\int_t^s(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr}G(u(s,\tau,\omega,u_0),v(s,\tau,\omega,v_0))ds.\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

Lemma 4.3. *Assume that* (3.4)-(3.6) *and* (3.105) *hold. Then there exists* $\varepsilon_0=\varepsilon_0(\alpha,\lambda,f)\in(0,1)$ *such that for all* $\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_0]$, $\tau\in\mathbb{R}$ *and* $\omega\in\Omega$, *the sequence*

$$\{(u(\tau,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n}),v(\tau,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_{0,n}))\}_{n=1}^\infty$$

of solutions of (3.9)-(3.11) *has a convergent subsequence in* $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *if* $t_n\to\infty$ *and* $(u_{0,n},z_{0,n})\in D(\tau-t_n,\theta_{-t_n}\omega)$ *with* $D\in\mathcal{D}$ *and* $v_{0,n}=z_{0,n}-\varepsilon y(\omega)u_{0,n}$.

Proof. By Lemma 4.1 with $s = 0$ we find that there exists $\varepsilon_1 \in (0,1)$ such that for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1]$, the sequence $(u(\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_{0,n}), v(\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, v_{0,n}))$ is bounded in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Therefore, there exist $(\widetilde{u}, \widetilde{v}) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and a subsequence (not relabeled) such that

$$(u(\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_{0,n}), v(\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, v_{0,n})) \rightharpoonup (\widetilde{u}, \widetilde{v}) \text{ in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n), \tag{4.16}$$

which implies

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \|(u(\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_{0,n}), v(\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, v_{0,n}))\|_{H^1\times L^2} \geq \|(\widetilde{u}, \widetilde{v})\|_{H^1\times L^2}. \tag{4.17}$$

The proof will be completed if we can show

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \|(u(\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_{0,n}), v(\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, v_{0,n}))\|_{H^1\times L^2} \leq \|(\widetilde{u}, \widetilde{v})\|_{H^1\times L^2}, \tag{4.18}$$

because (4.16)-(4.18) yield the strong convergence of $(u(\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_{0,n}), v(\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, v_{0,n}))$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Next, we prove (4.18) by the energy equation (4). By Lemma 4.1, there exist $\varepsilon_2 \in (0, \varepsilon_1)$ and $N_1 = N_1(\tau, \omega, D) \geq 1$ such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_2]$, $n \geq N_1$ and $s \in [-t_n, 0]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|u(\tau + s, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_{0,n})\|^2_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|v(\tau + s, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, v_{0,n})\|^2 \\
&\quad + \|u(\tau + s, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_{0,n})\|^{\gamma+1}_{L^{\gamma+1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\
&\quad \leq C_1 + e^{\int_s^0 (2\sigma - \varepsilon c - \varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr} R(\tau, \omega).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

Let m be a positive integer and $N_2 = N_2(\tau, \omega, D, m) \geq N_1$ such that $t_n \geq m$ for all $n \geq N_2$. By (4.19) we have, for $n \geq N_2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|u(\tau - m, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_{0,n})\|^2_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|v(\tau - m, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, v_{0,n})\|^2 \\
&\quad + \|u(\tau - m, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_{0,n})\|^{\gamma+1}_{L^{\gamma+1}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\
&\quad \leq C_1 + e^{\int_{-m}^0 (2\sigma - \varepsilon c - \varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr} R(\tau, \omega).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

Thus, for every fixed m, the sequence $\{(u(\tau - m, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_{0,n}), v(\tau - m, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, v_{0,n}))\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and hence, by a diagonal process we infer that there exist a subsequence (not relabeled) and $(\widetilde{u}_m, \widetilde{v}_m) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, as $n \to \infty$,

$$(u(\tau - m, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_{0,n}), v(\tau - m, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, v_{0,n})) \rightharpoonup (\widetilde{u}_m, \widetilde{v}_m) \tag{4.21}$$

in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Note that for $s \in [-m, 0]$,

$$(u(\tau + s, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_{0,n}), v(\tau + s, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, v_{0,n}))$$

$$= (u(\tau+s,\tau-m,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u(\tau-m,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n})),v(\tau+s,\tau-m,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v(\tau-m,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_{0,n}))). \tag{4.22}$$

By (4.22) and Lemma 3.6 we find that, for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist a subsequence $(t_{n'}, u_{0,n'}, v_{0,n'})$ and a solution $(u_m(\cdot,\tau-m,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,\widetilde{u}_m), v_m(\cdot,\tau-m,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,\widetilde{v}_m))$ of (3.9)-(3.11) with initial condition $(\widetilde{u}_m.\widetilde{v}_m)$ such that for all $s \in [-m,0]$, when $n' \to \infty$,

$$u(\tau+s,\tau-t_{n'},\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n'}) \rightharpoonup u_m(\tau+s,\tau-m,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,\widetilde{u}_m) \text{ in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^n),$$

and

$$v(\tau+s,\tau-t_{n'},\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_{0,n'}) \rightharpoonup v_m(\tau+s,\tau-m,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,\widetilde{v}_m) \text{ in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Note that this subsequence $(t_{n'}, u_{0,n'}, v_{0,n'})$ may depend on m. However, by an appropriate diagonal process, we can choose a common subsequence (which is denoted again by $(t_n, u_{0,n}, v_{0,n})$) such that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s \in [-m,0]$, when $n \to \infty$,

$$u(\tau+s,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n}) \rightharpoonup u_m(\tau+s,\tau-m,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,\widetilde{u}_m) \text{ in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^n), \tag{4.23}$$

and

$$v(\tau+s,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_{0,n}) \rightharpoonup v_m(\tau+s,\tau-m,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,\widetilde{v}_m) \text{ in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^n). \tag{4.24}$$

As a result of (4.16) and (4.23)-(4.24) with $s=0$ we get

$$\widetilde{u} = u_m(\tau,\tau-m,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,\widetilde{u}_m) \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{v} = v_m(\tau,\tau-m,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,\widetilde{v}_m). \tag{4.25}$$

For $(u(\tau,\tau-m,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u(\tau-m,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n})),v(\tau,\tau-m,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v(\tau-m,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_{0,n})))$ with initial condition $(u(\tau-m,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n}),v(\tau-m,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n}))$, by (4.22) and the energy equation (4) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&E(u(\tau,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n}),v(\tau,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_{0,n}))\\
&= e^{\int_\tau^{\tau-m}(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_{r-\tau}\omega)|)dr}E(u(\tau-m,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n}),v(\tau-m,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_{0,n}))\\
&\quad+\int_{\tau-m}^{\tau} e^{\int_\tau^{s}(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_{r-\tau}\omega)|)dr}G(u(s,\tau-m,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u(\tau-m,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n})),v)ds\\
&= e^{\int_0^{-m}(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_{r}\omega)|)dr}E(u(\tau-m,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n}),v(\tau-m,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_{0,n}))\\
&\quad+\int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^{s}(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_{r}\omega)|)dr}G(u(s+\tau,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n}),v(s+\tau,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_{0,n}))ds
\end{aligned}$$

which along with (4) produces

$$E(u(\tau,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n}),v(\tau,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_{0,n}))$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= e^{\int_0^{-m}(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr} E(u(\tau-m,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n}),v(\tau-m,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_{0,n}))\\
&-2\int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^{s}(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr}\left(\alpha-\delta-2\sigma+\varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega)|+y(\theta_s\omega))\right)\|v(s+\tau,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_{0,n})\|^2 ds\\
&-2(\lambda+\delta^2-\alpha\delta)\int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^{s}(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr}(\delta-2\sigma+\varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega)|-y(\theta_s\omega)))\|u(s+\tau,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n})\|^2\\
&-2\int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^{s}(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr}(\delta-2\sigma+\varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega)|-y(\theta_s\omega)))\|\nabla u(s+\tau,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n})\|^2 ds\\
&+2\int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^{s}(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr}(g(s+\tau),v(s+\tau,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_{0,n}))ds\\
&-2\varepsilon\int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^{s}(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr}(\varepsilon y(\theta_s\omega)-2\delta)y(\theta_s\omega)(u(s+\tau,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n}),v)ds\\
&+2\int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^{s}(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr}(\varepsilon y(\theta_s\omega)-\delta)(f(x,u(s+\tau)),u(s+\tau))ds\\
&+4\int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^{s}(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr}(2\sigma-\varepsilon|y(\theta_s\omega)|)\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}F(x,u(s+\tau,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n}))dxds. \qquad (4.26)
\end{aligned}
$$

By (4.5) there exists $M_1=M_1(\omega)\geq 1$ such that for all $m\geq M_1$

$$
\int_{-m}^{0}|y(\theta_r\omega)|dr\leq\frac{1}{\alpha}m,
$$

and thus for $\varepsilon\in(0,\frac{1}{2}\alpha\sigma)$ we get

$$
\int_{0}^{-m}(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr\leq-3\sigma m. \qquad (4.27)
$$

By (4.12) and (4.27) we have for $m\geq M_1$ and $t_n\geq m$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&e^{\int_0^{-m}(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr} E(u(\tau-m,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n}),v(\tau-m,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_{0,n}))\\
&\leq e^{-3\sigma m}\left(\|v(\tau-m,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_{0,n})\|^2+(\lambda+\delta^2-\alpha\delta)\|u(\tau-m,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n})\|^2\right)\\
&+e^{-3\sigma m}\|\nabla u(\tau-m,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n})\|^2\\
&+2e^{\int_0^{-m}(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}F(x,u(\tau-m,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n}))dx. \qquad (4.28)
\end{aligned}
$$

By (3.4)-(3.5) and (4.20) we get for all $n\geq N_2$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}F(x,u(\tau-m,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n}))dx\\
&\leq C_3\left(\|u(\tau-m,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n})\|^2+\|u(\tau-m,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n})\|^{\gamma+1}_{L^{\gamma+1}}+1\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$\leq C_4 + C_4 e^{\int_{-m}^{0}(2\sigma - \varepsilon c - \varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr} \leq C_4 + C_4 e^{2\sigma m}. \tag{4.29}$$

By (4.20) and (4.27)-(4.29) we get for all $m \geq M_1$ and $n \geq N_2$,

$$e^{\int_0^{-m}(4\sigma - 2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr} E(u(\tau - m, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_{0,n}), v(\tau - m, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, v_{0,n}))$$

$$\leq C_5 e^{-3\sigma m}(1 + e^{2\sigma m}) \leq 2C_5 e^{-\sigma m}. \tag{4.30}$$

Note that $\alpha - \delta - 2\sigma + \varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega)| + y(\theta_s\omega)$ is nonnegative for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ by (3.103) and (3.104). Therefore, by (4.24) and Fatou's Theorem we obtain the following inequality for the second term on the right-hand side of (4.26):

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s(4\sigma - 2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr} \left(\alpha - \delta - 2\sigma + \varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega)| + y(\theta_s\omega))\right) \|v(s+\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, v_{0,n})\|^2 ds$$

$$\geq \int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s(4\sigma - 2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr} \left(\alpha - \delta - 2\sigma + \varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega)| + y(\theta_s\omega))\right) \liminf_{n\to\infty} \|v(s+\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, v_{0,n})\|^2 ds$$

$$\geq \int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s(4\sigma - 2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr} \left(\alpha - \delta - 2\sigma + \varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega)| + y(\theta_s\omega))\right) \|v_m(s+\tau, \tau - m, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, \widetilde{v}_m)\|^2 ds. \tag{4.31}$$

Similarly, we can also prove

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s(4\sigma - 2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr} (\delta - 2\sigma + \varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega)| - y(\theta_s\omega)))\|u(s+\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_{0,n})\|^2$$

$$\geq \int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s(4\sigma - 2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr} (\delta - 2\sigma + \varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega)| - y(\theta_s\omega)))\|u_m(s+\tau, \tau - m, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, \widetilde{u}_m)\|^2 \tag{4.32}$$

and

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s(4\sigma - 2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr} (\delta - 2\sigma + \varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega)| - y(\theta_s\omega)))\|\nabla u(s+\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_{0,n})\|^2$$

$$\geq \int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s(4\sigma - 2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr} (\delta - 2\sigma + \varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega)| - y(\theta_s\omega)))\|\nabla u_m(s+\tau, \tau - m, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, \widetilde{u}_m)\|^2. \tag{4.33}$$

We now deal with the nonlinear terms in (4.26), for which we first prove the following convergence in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$: for every $s \in [-m, 0]$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} u(\tau + s, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_{0,n}) = u_m(\tau + s, \tau - m, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, \widetilde{u}_m) \text{ in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^n). \tag{4.34}$$

Given $\eta > 0$, by Lemma 4.2 we find that there exist $\varepsilon_3 \in (0, \varepsilon_2)$, $N_3 = N_3(\tau, \omega, D, \eta, m) \geq 1$ and $K = K(\tau, \omega, \eta, m) \geq 1$ such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_3)$, $s \in [-m, 0]$ and $n \geq N_3$,

$$\int_{|x|\geq K} |u(s+\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_{0,n})|^2 dx \leq \eta. \tag{4.35}$$

Thus (4.34) follows from (4.23) and the compact embedding $H^1 \hookrightarrow L^2$ in bounded domains. By (3.4)-(3.5), (4.19), (4.34) and the arguments of (3) and (3) we obtain

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr}(2\sigma-\varepsilon|y(\theta_s\omega)|)\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x,u(s+\tau,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n}))dxds$$

$$=\int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr}(2\sigma-\varepsilon|y(\theta_s\omega)|)\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x,u_m(s+\tau,\tau-m,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,\widetilde{u}_m))dxds \tag{4.36}$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr}(\varepsilon y(\theta_s\omega)-\delta)(f(x,u(s+\tau)),u(s+\tau,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n}))ds$$

$$=\int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr}(\varepsilon y(\theta_s\omega)-\delta)(f(x,u_m(s+\tau)),u_m(s+\tau,\tau-m,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,\widetilde{u}_m))ds. \tag{4.37}$$

By (4.19), (4.34) and the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, we also obtain

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr}(g(s+\tau),v(s+\tau,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_{0,n}))ds$$

$$=\int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr}(g(s+\tau),v_m(s+\tau,\tau-m,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,\widetilde{v}_m))ds \tag{4.38}$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr}(\varepsilon y(\theta_s\omega)-2\delta)y(\theta_s\omega)(u(s+\tau,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n}),v)ds$$

$$=\int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr}(\varepsilon y(\theta_s\omega)-2\delta)y(\theta_s\omega)(u_m(s+\tau,\tau-m,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,\widetilde{u}_m,v_m)ds. \tag{4.39}$$

It follows from (4.26), (4.31)-(4.33) and (4)-(4.39) that for all $m \geq M_1$,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} E(u(\tau,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n}),v(\tau,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_{0,n}))$$

$$\leq 2C_2e^{-\sigma m}-2\int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr}\left(\alpha-\delta-2\sigma+\varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega)|+y(\theta_s\omega))\right)\|v_m(s+\tau,\tau-m,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,\widetilde{v}_m)\|^2ds$$

$$-2(\lambda+\delta^2-\alpha\delta)\int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr}(\delta-2\sigma+\varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega)|-y(\theta_s\omega)))\|u_m(s+\tau,\tau-m,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,\widetilde{u}_m)\|^2$$

$$-2\int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr}(\delta-2\sigma+\varepsilon(|y(\theta_s\omega)|-y(\theta_s\omega)))\|\nabla u_m(s+\tau,\tau-m,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,\widetilde{u}_m)\|^2ds$$

$$+2\int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s(4\sigma-2\varepsilon|y(\theta_r\omega)|)dr}(g(s+\tau),v_m(s+\tau,\tau-m,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,\widetilde{v}_m))ds$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-2\varepsilon \int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s (4\sigma - 2\varepsilon |y(\theta_r \omega)|)dr} (\varepsilon y(\theta_s \omega) - 2\delta) y(\theta_s \omega) (u_m(s+\tau, \tau - m, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, \widetilde{u}_m), v_m) ds \\
&+2 \int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s (4\sigma - 2\varepsilon |y(\theta_r \omega)|)dr} (\varepsilon y(\theta_s \omega) - \delta) (f(x, u_m(s+\tau)), u_m(s+\tau, \tau - m, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, \widetilde{u}_m)) ds \\
&+ 4 \int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s (4\sigma - 2\varepsilon |y(\theta_r \omega)|)dr} (2\sigma - \varepsilon |y(\theta_s \omega)|) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x, u_m(s+\tau, \tau - m, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, \widetilde{u}_m)) dx ds. \qquad (4.40)
\end{aligned}
$$

On the other hand, by (4) and (4.25) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
E(\widetilde{u}, \widetilde{v}) &= E(u_m(\tau, \tau - m, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, \widetilde{u}_m), v_m(\tau, \tau - m, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, \widetilde{v}_m)) \\
&= e^{\int_0^{-m} (4\sigma - 2\varepsilon |y(\theta_r \omega)|)dr} E(\widetilde{u}_m, \widetilde{v}_m) \\
&-2 \int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s (4\sigma - 2\varepsilon |y(\theta_r \omega)|)dr} \left(\alpha - \delta - 2\sigma + \varepsilon(|y(\theta_s \omega)| + y(\theta_s \omega))\right) \|v_m(s+\tau, \tau - m, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, \widetilde{v}_m)\|^2 ds \\
&-2(\lambda + \delta^2 - \alpha\delta) \int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s (4\sigma - 2\varepsilon |y(\theta_r \omega)|)dr} (\delta - 2\sigma + \varepsilon(|y(\theta_s \omega)| - y(\theta_s \omega))) \|u_m(s+\tau, \tau - m, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, \widetilde{u}_m)\|^2 \\
&-2 \int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s (4\sigma - 2\varepsilon |y(\theta_r \omega)|)dr} (\delta - 2\sigma + \varepsilon(|y(\theta_s \omega)| - y(\theta_s \omega))) \|\nabla u_m(s+\tau, \tau - m, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, \widetilde{u}_m)\|^2 ds \\
&+2 \int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s (4\sigma - 2\varepsilon |y(\theta_r \omega)|)dr} (g(s+\tau), v_m(s+\tau, \tau - m, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, \widetilde{v}_m)) ds \\
&-2\varepsilon \int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s (4\sigma - 2\varepsilon |y(\theta_r \omega)|)dr} (\varepsilon y(\theta_s \omega) - 2\delta) y(\theta_s \omega) (u_m(s+\tau, \tau - m, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, \widetilde{u}_m), v_m) ds \\
&+2 \int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s (4\sigma - 2\varepsilon |y(\theta_r \omega)|)dr} (\varepsilon y(\theta_s \omega) - \delta) (f(x, u_m(s+\tau)), u_m(s+\tau, \tau - m, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, \widetilde{u}_m)) ds \\
&+ 4 \int_{-m}^{0} e^{\int_0^s (4\sigma - 2\varepsilon |y(\theta_r \omega)|)dr} (2\sigma - \varepsilon |y(\theta_s \omega)|) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x, u_m(s+\tau, \tau - m, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, \widetilde{u}_m)) dx ds. \qquad (4.41)
\end{aligned}
$$

By (4.40)-(4.41), (4.12), (3.6) and (4.27) we get for all $m \geq M_1$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{n \to \infty} E(u(\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_{0,n}), v(\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, v_{0,n})) \\
&\leq 2C_2 e^{-\sigma m} - e^{\int_0^{-m} (4\sigma - 2\varepsilon |y(\theta_r \omega)|)dr} E(\widetilde{u}_m, \widetilde{v}_m) + E(\widetilde{u}, \widetilde{v}) \\
&\leq 2C_2 e^{-\sigma m} - 2 e^{\int_0^{-m} (4\sigma - 2\varepsilon |y(\theta_r \omega)|)dr} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x, \widetilde{u}_m) dx + E(\widetilde{u}, \widetilde{v}) \\
&\leq 2C_2 e^{-\sigma m} + 2 e^{\int_0^{-m} (4\sigma - 2\varepsilon |y(\theta_r \omega)|)dr} \|\phi_3\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} + E(\widetilde{u}, \widetilde{v}) \\
&\leq 2C_2 e^{-\sigma m} + 2 e^{-3\sigma m} \|\phi_3\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} + E(\widetilde{u}, \widetilde{v}). \qquad (4.42)
\end{aligned}
$$

By (4.34) with $s = 0$ and the arguments of (3.77) we infer that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x, u(\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_{0,n}))dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x, u_m(\tau, \tau - m, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, \widetilde{u}_m)dx$$

which together with (4.25) yields

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x, u(\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_{0,n}))dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(x, \widetilde{u})dx. \tag{4.43}$$

By (4.12) and (4)-(4.43) we get

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}(\|v(\tau,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_{0,n})\|^2+(\lambda+\delta^2-\alpha\delta)\|u(\tau,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n})\|^2+\|\nabla u(\tau,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,_{0,n})\|^2)$$

$$\leq \|\widetilde{v}\|^2 + (\lambda + \delta^2 - \alpha\delta)\|\widetilde{u}\|^2 + \|\nabla\widetilde{u}\|^2 + 2C_2 e^{-\sigma m} + 2e^{-3\sigma m}\|\phi_3\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \tag{4.44}$$

Taking the limit of (4.44) as $m \to \infty$ we get

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}(\|v(\tau,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_{0,n})\|^2+(\lambda+\delta^2-\alpha\delta)\|u(\tau,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_{0,n})\|^2+\|\nabla u(\tau,\tau-t_n,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,_{0,n})\|^2)$$

$$\leq \|\widetilde{v}\|^2 + (\lambda + \delta^2 - \alpha\delta)\|\widetilde{u}\|^2 + \|\nabla\widetilde{u}\|^2. \tag{4.45}$$

Note that $\left(\|v\|^2 + (\lambda + \delta^2 - \alpha\delta)\|u\|^2 + \|\nabla u\|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is an equivalent norm for $(u, v) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Therefore, from (4.45) we obtain

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}(\|u(\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_{0,n})\|^2_{H^1} + \|v(\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, v_{0,n})\|^2) \leq \|\widetilde{u}\|^2_{H^1} + \|\widetilde{v}\|^2.$$

This yields (4.18) and thus completes the proof. □

5 Random attractors for wave equations

This section is devoted to existence and uniqueness of $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractors for system (3.1)-(3.3). We first recall the existence of $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing sets from [46].

Lemma 5.1. *Under conditions* (3.4)-(3.6) *and* (3.105)*, there exists* $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(\alpha, \lambda, f) \in (0, 1)$ *such that for all* $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$*, the multivalued non-autonomous cocycle* Φ *has a closed* $\mathcal{D}$*-pullback absorbing set* $K \in \mathcal{D}$*:*

$$K(\tau, \omega) = \{(u, z) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) : \|u\|^2_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \|z\|^2 \leq L(\tau, \omega)\} \tag{5.1}$$

for $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ *and* $\omega \in \Omega$*, where* $L(\tau, \omega)$ *is given by*

$$L(\tau, \omega) = M(1 + \varepsilon y^2(\omega))\left(1 + \int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{\int_0^s (2\sigma - \varepsilon c - \varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr}\left(1 + \|g(s + \tau, \cdot)\|^2 + \varepsilon|y(\theta_s\omega)|^2\right)ds\right) \tag{5.2}$$

with M *and* c *being positive constants independent of* τ*,* ω*,* D *and* ε*.*

Proof. This lemma can be derived from (3.13) and the details can be found in [46]. ☐

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose* (3.4)-(3.6) *and* (3.105) *hold and* K *is the closed* $\mathcal{D}$*-pullback absorbing set given by* (5.1)-(5.2). *Then there exists* $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(\alpha, \lambda, f) \in (0, 1)$ *such that for all* $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$, *the mapping* $\Phi(t, \tau, \cdot, K(\tau, \cdot)) : \Omega_m \to 2^{H^1 \times L^2}$ *is weakly upper semicontinuous for all* $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ *and* $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Let $\omega_n \to \omega$ in Ω_m and $(\widetilde{u}_n, \widetilde{z}_n) \in \Phi(t, \tau, \omega_n, K(\tau, \omega_n))$. We need to find $(\widetilde{u}, \widetilde{z}) \in \Phi(t, \tau, \omega, K(\tau, \omega))$ such that, up to a subsequence,

$$(\widetilde{u}_n, \widetilde{z}_n) \rightharpoonup (\widetilde{u}, \widetilde{z}) \text{ in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n). \tag{5.3}$$

Since $(\widetilde{u}_n, \widetilde{z}_n) \in \Phi(t, \tau, \omega_n, K(\tau, \omega_n))$, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist $(u_{0,n}, z_{0,n}) \in K(\tau, \omega_n)$ and $(u_n(\cdot, \tau, \theta_{-\tau}\omega_n, u_{0,n}), z_n(\cdot, \tau, \theta_{-\tau}\omega_n, z_{0,n}))$ with initial condition $(u_{0,n}, z_{0,n})$ at τ such that

$$(\widetilde{u}_n, \widetilde{z}_n) = (u_n(t + \tau, \tau, \theta_{-\tau}\omega_n, u_{0,n}), z_n(t + \tau, \tau, \theta_{-\tau}\omega_n, z_{0,n})). \tag{5.4}$$

By (3.101) we have

$$z_n(t, \tau, \theta_{-\tau}\omega_n, z_{0,n}) = v_n(t, \tau, \theta_{-\tau}\omega_n, v_{0,n}) + \varepsilon y(\theta_{t-\tau}\omega_n) u_n(t, \tau, \theta_{-\tau}\omega_n, u_{0,n}) \tag{5.5}$$

with

$$v_{0,n} = z_{0,n} - \varepsilon y(\omega_n) u_{0,n}. \tag{5.6}$$

Since $(u_{0,n}, z_{0,n}) \in K(\tau, \omega_n)$, by (5.1)-(5.2) we get for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|u_{0,n}\|^2_{H^1} + \|z_{0,n}\|^2 \\ &\leq M(1 + \varepsilon y^2(\omega_n)) \left(1 + \int_{-\infty}^0 e^{\int_0^s (2\sigma - \varepsilon c - \varepsilon c |y(\theta_r \omega_n)|^2) dr} \left(1 + \|g(s + \tau, \cdot)\|^2 + \varepsilon |y(\theta_s \omega_n)|^2\right) ds\right). \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

Since $\omega_n \in \Omega_m$, by (3.14) we find that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s \leq -m$,

$$\int_s^0 |y(\theta_r \omega_n)|^2 dr \leq -\frac{s}{\alpha}. \tag{5.8}$$

Let $\varepsilon_1 = \frac{\alpha\sigma}{c(1+\alpha)}$. By (5.8) and (3.15) we get for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s \leq -m$,

$$e^{\int_0^s (2\sigma - \varepsilon c - \varepsilon c |y(\theta_r \omega_n)|^2) dr} \leq e^{\sigma s} \quad \text{and } |y(\theta_s \omega_n)|^2 \leq 4s^2 + C_1. \tag{5.9}$$

By (5.9), Lemma 3.1 (i) and the dominated convergence theorem we obtain

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{-\infty}^{-m} e^{\int_0^s (2\sigma - \varepsilon c - \varepsilon c |y(\theta_r \omega_n)|^2) dr} \left(1 + \|g(s + \tau, \cdot)\|^2 + \varepsilon |y(\theta_s \omega_n)|^2\right) ds$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{-m} e^{\int_0^s (2\sigma - \varepsilon c - \varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr} \left(1 + \|g(s+\tau,\cdot)\|^2 + \varepsilon|y(\theta_s\omega)|^2\right) ds$$

which along with Lemma 3.1 (i) again implies

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{\int_0^s (2\sigma - \varepsilon c - \varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega_n)|^2)dr} \left(1 + \|g(s+\tau,\cdot)\|^2 + \varepsilon|y(\theta_s\omega_n)|^2\right) ds$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{\int_0^s (2\sigma - \varepsilon c - \varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr} \left(1 + \|g(s+\tau,\cdot)\|^2 + \varepsilon|y(\theta_s\omega)|^2\right) ds. \tag{5.10}$$

By (5.10) and Lemma 3.1 (i), we get from (5.7)

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}(\|u_{0,n}\|^2_{H^1} + \|z_{0,n}\|^2)$$

$$\leq M(1+\varepsilon y^2(\omega)) \left(1 + \int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{\int_0^s (2\sigma - \varepsilon c - \varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr} \left(1 + \|g(s+\tau,\cdot)\|^2 + \varepsilon|y(\theta_s\omega)|^2\right) ds\right). \tag{5.11}$$

This indicates the sequence $\{(u_{0,n}, z_{0,n})\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and hence there exists $(u_0, z_0) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that, up to a subsequence,

$$(u_{0,n}, z_{0,n}) \rightharpoonup (u_0, z_0) \ \text{ in } \ H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n). \tag{5.12}$$

By (5)-(5.12) we get

$$\|u_0\|^2_{H^1} + \|z_0\|^2$$

$$\leq M(1+\varepsilon y^2(\omega)) \left(1 + \int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{\int_0^s (2\sigma - \varepsilon c - \varepsilon c|y(\theta_r\omega)|^2)dr} \left(1 + \|g(s+\tau,\cdot)\|^2 + \varepsilon|y(\theta_s\omega)|^2\right) ds\right). \tag{5.13}$$

By (5.5) with $t=\tau$, (5.6), (5.12) and Lemma 3.1 we have

$$(u_{0,n}, v_{0,n}) \rightharpoonup (u_0, v_0) \ \text{ in } \ H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ with } v_0 = z_0 - \varepsilon y(\omega) u_0. \tag{5.14}$$

Using (5.14), following the proof of Lemma 3.5 (i), we infer that system (3.9)-(3.11) has a solution $(u,v) = (u(\cdot,\tau,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_0), v(\cdot,\tau,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_0))$ with initial condition (u_0,v_0) at τ such that, up to a subsequence, for all $r\geq\tau$,

$$(u_n(r,\tau,\theta_{-\tau}\omega_n,u_{0,n}), v_n(r,\tau,\theta_{-\tau}\omega_n,v_{0,n})) \rightharpoonup (u(r,\tau,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_0), v(r,\tau,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_0))$$

in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, which together with (5.5)-(5.6) and Lemma 3.1 implies for all $r\geq\tau$,

$$(u_n(r,\tau,\theta_{-\tau}\omega_n,u_{0,n}), z_n(r,\tau,\theta_{-\tau}\omega_n,z_{0,n})) \rightharpoonup (u(r,\tau,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,u_0), z(r,\tau,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,z_0)) \tag{5.15}$$

in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ where

$$z(r,\tau,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,z_0) = v(r,\tau,\theta_{-\tau}\omega,v_0) + \varepsilon y(\theta_{r-\tau}\omega) u(r,\tau,\theta_{-\tau}\omega_n,u_0)$$

with $v_0 = z_0 - \varepsilon y(\omega) u_0$. By (5.4) and (5.15) we get for $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$,

$$(\widetilde{u}_n, \widetilde{z}_n) \rightharpoonup (u(t+\tau, \tau, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_0), z(t+\tau, \tau, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, z_0)) \ \text{ in } \ H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n). \tag{5.16}$$

By (5.1)-(5.2) and (5) we have $(u_0, v_0) \in K(\tau, \omega)$, which along with (5.16) implies (5.3) with $\widetilde{u} = u(t+\tau, \tau, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_0)$ and $\widetilde{z} = z(t+\tau, \tau, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, z_0)$, and thus completes the proof. □

Next, we prove the $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotic compactness of Φ.

Lemma 5.3. *Under conditions* (3.4)-(3.6) *and* (3.105), *there exists* $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(\alpha, \lambda, f) \in (0,1)$ *such that for all* $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$, Φ *is* $\mathcal{D}$*-pullback asymptotically compact in* $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Proof. Given $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$, $D \in \mathcal{D}$ and $(\widetilde{u}_n, \widetilde{z}_n) \in \Phi(t_n, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-t_n}\omega, D(\tau - t_n, \theta_{-t_n}\omega))$ with $t_n \to \infty$. We want to prove $(\widetilde{u}_n, \widetilde{z}_n)$ has a convergent subsequence. By assumption, there exist $(u_{0,n}, z_{0,n}) \in D(\tau - t_n, \theta_{-t_n}\omega)$ and $(u_n(\cdot, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_{0,n}), z_n(\cdot, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, z_{0,n}))$ with initial condition $(u_{0,n}, z_{0,n})$ at $\tau - t_n$ such that

$$(\widetilde{u}_n, \widetilde{z}_n) = (u_n(\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_{0,n}), z_n(\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, z_{0,n})). \tag{5.17}$$

By (3.102) and (5.17) we have

$$(\widetilde{u}_n, \widetilde{z}_n) = (u_n(\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_{0,n}), v_n(\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, v_{0,n}) + \varepsilon y(\omega) u_n(\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_{0,n})). \tag{5.18}$$

By Lemma 4.3, the sequence $\{(u_n(\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, u_{0,n}), v_n(\tau, \tau - t_n, \theta_{-\tau}\omega, v_{0,n}))\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ has a convergent subsequence in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and so is the sequence $\{(\widetilde{u}_n, \widetilde{z}_n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ by (5.18). This completes the proof. □

Finally, we prove the existence and uniqueness of random attractors of Φ.

Theorem 5.4. *Suppose* (3.4)-(3.6) *and* (3.105) *hold. Then there exists* $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(\alpha, \lambda, f) \in (0,1)$ *such that for all* $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$, *system* (3.1)-(3.3) *has a unique* $\mathcal{D}$*-pullback attractor* $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{D}$ *in* $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$*. Furthermore, if* $g : \mathbb{R} \to L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *is* T*-periodic for some* $T > 0$*, then so is the attractor* $\mathcal{A}$*; that is,* $\mathcal{A}(\tau + T, \omega) = \mathcal{A}(\tau, \omega)$ *for all* $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ *and* $\omega \in \Omega$.

Proof. We have proved that Φ satisfies all conditions (i)-(iv) of Theorem 2.14; more precisely, Φ is $\mathcal{D}$-pullback asymptotically compact in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by Lemma 5.3, $\Phi(t, \tau, \omega, \cdot) : H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \to 2^{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ is upper semicontinuous by Lemma 3.9, Φ has a closed $\mathcal{D}$-pullback absorbing set $K \in \mathcal{D}$ by Lemma 5.1, and $\Phi(t, \tau, \cdot, K(\tau, \cdot)) : \Omega_m \to 2^{H^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ is weakly upper semicontinuous by Lemma 5.2. As a result, the existence and uniqueness of $\mathcal{D}$-pullback attractors of Φ follows immediately.

If $g : \mathbb{R} \to L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is T-periodic, then one can check that Φ is also T-periodic: $\Phi(t, \tau + T, \omega, \cdot) = \Phi(t, \tau, \omega, \cdot)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$. On the other hand, by (5.1)-(5.2) we see that $K(\tau + T, \omega) = K(\tau, \omega)$ for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$ in the present case. Therefore, the T-periodicity of $\mathcal{A}$ follows from Theorem 2.14 again. $\square$

References

[1] L. Arnold, *Random Dynamical Systems*, Springer-Verlag, 1998.

[2] J.M. Arrieta, A.N. Carvalho and J.K. Hale, A damped hyperbolic equation with critical exponent, *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, **17** (1992), 841-866.

[3] A.V. Babin and M.I. Vishik, *Attractors of Evolution Equations*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1992.

[4] J.M. Ball, Global attractors for damped semilinear wave equations, *Discrete Continuous Dynamical Systems*, **10** (2004), 31-52.

[5] P.W. Bates, H. Lisei and K. Lu, Attractors for stochastic lattice dynamical systems, *Stoch. Dyn.*, **6** (2006), 1-21.

[6] P.W. Bates, K. Lu and B. Wang, Random attractors for stochastic reaction-diffusion equations on unbounded domains, *J. Differential Equations*, **246** (2009), 845-869.

[7] T. Caraballo, M.J. Garrido-Atienza, B. Schmalfuss and J. Valero, Non-autonomous and random attractors for delay random semilinear equations without uniqueness, *Discrete Continuous Dynamical Systems*, **21** (2008), 415-443.

[8] T. Caraballo, J. Real, I.D. Chueshov, Pullback attractors for stochastic heat equations in materials with memory, *Discrete Continuous Dynamical Systems B*, **9** (2008), 525-539.

[9] T. Caraballo and J. A. Langa, On the upper semicontinuity of cocycle attractors for non-autonomous and random dynamical systems, *Dynamics of Continuous, Discrete and Impulsive Systems Series A: Mathematical Analysis*, **10** (2003), 491-513.

[10] T. Caraballo, M. J. Garrido-Atienza, B. Schmalfuss and J. Valero, Asymptotic behaviour of a stochastic semilinear dissipative functional equation without uniqueness of solutions, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B*, **14** (2010), 439-455.

[11] T. Caraballo, M. J. Garrido-Atienza and T. Taniguchi, The existence and exponential behavior of solutions to stochastic delay evolution equations with a fractional Brownian motion, *Nonlinear Anal.*, **74** (2011), 3671-3684.

[12] T. Caraballo, J. A. Langa, V.S. Melnik and J. Valero, Pullback attractors for nonautonomous and stochastic multivalued dynamical systems, *Set-Valued Analysis*, **11** (2003), 153-201.

[13] T. Caraballo, J. A. Langa and J. Valero, Global attractors for multivalued random dynamical systems generated by random differential inclusions with multiplicative noise, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **260** (2001), 602-622.

[14] T. Caraballo, F. Morillas and J. Valero, Random attractors for stochastic lattice systems with non-Lipschitz nonlinearity, *Journal of Difference Equations and Applications*, **17** (2011), 161-184.

[15] I. Chueshov and I. Lasiecka, Attractors for second-order evolution equations with a nonlinear damping, *J. Dynam. Differential Equations*, **16** (2004), 469-512.

[16] I. Chueshov and M. Scheutzow, On the structure of attractors and invariant measures for a class of monotone random systems, *Dynamical Systems*, **19** (2004), 127-144.

[17] I. Chueshow, *Monotone Random Systems - Theory and Applications*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1779, Springer, Berlin, 2001.

[18] H. Crauel, A. Debussche and F. Flandoli, Random attractors, *J. Dyn. Diff. Eqns.*, **9** (1997), 307-341.

[19] H. Crauel and F. Flandoli, Attractors for random dynamical systems, *Probab. Th. Re. Fields*, **100** (1994), 365-393.

[20] J. Duan and B. Schmalfuss, The 3D quasigeostrophic fluid dynamics under random forcing on boundary, *Comm. Math. Sci.*, **1** (2003), 133-151.

[21] E. Feireisl, Attractors for semilinear damped wave equations on $\mathbb{R}^3$, *Nonlinear Analysis TMA*, **23** (1994), 187-195.

[22] E. Feireisl, Global attractors for semilinear damped wave equations with supercritical exponent, *J. Differential Equations*, **116** (1995) 431-447.

[23] E. Feireisl and E. Zuazua, Global attractors for semilinear wave equations with locally distributed nonlinear damping and critical exponent, *Communications in Partial Differential Equations* **18** (1993) 1539-1555.

[24] F. Flandoli and B. Schmalfuss, Random attractors for the 3D stochastic Navier-Stokes equation with multiplicative noise, *Stoch. Stoch. Rep.*, **59** (1996), 21-45.

[25] M.J. Garrido-Atienza and B. Schmalfuss, Ergodicity of the infinite dimensional fractional Brownian motion, *J. Dynam. Differential Equations*, *23* (2011), 671-681.

[26] M.J. Garrido-Atienza, A. Ogrowsky and B. Schmalfuss, Random differential equations with random delays, *Stoch. Dyn.*, **11** (2011), 369-388.

[27] M.J. Garrido-Atienza, B. Maslowski and B. Schmalfuss, Random attractors for stochastic equations driven by a fractional Brownian motion, *International J. Bifurcation and Chaos*, **20** (2010), 2761-2782.

[28] J.K. Hale, Asymptotic Behavior of Dissipative Systems, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1988.

[29] J. Huang and W. Shen, Pullback attractors for nonautonomous and random parabolic equations on non-smooth domains, *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems*, **24** (2009), 855-882.

[30] A. Kh. Khanmamedov, Global attractors for wave equations with nonlinear interior damping and critical exponents, *J. Differential Equations*, **230** (2006), 702-719.

[31] P.E. Kloeden and J.A. Langa, Flattening, squeezing and the existence of random attractors, *Proc. Royal Soc. London Serie A.*, **463** (2007), 163-181.

[32] Y. Lv and W. Wang, Limiting dynamics for stochastic wave equations, *J. Differential Equations*, **244** (2008), 1-23.

[33] M. Prizzi and K.P. Rybakowski, Attractors for semilinear damped wave equations on arbitrary unbounded domains, *Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal.*, **31** (2008), 49-82.

[34] M. Prizzi and K. P. Rybakowski, Attractors for singularly perturbed damped wave equations on unbounded domains, *Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal.*, **32** (2008), 1-20.

[35] M. Prizzi, Regularity of invariant sets in semilinear damped wave equations, *J. Differential Equations*, **247** (2009), 3315-3337.

[36] B. Schmalfuss, Backward cocycles and attractors of stochastic differential equations, *International Seminar on Applied Mathematics-Nonlinear Dynamics: Attractor Approximation and Global Behavior*, 185-192, Dresden, 1992.

[37] R. Sell and Y. You, Dynamics of Evolutionary Equations, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002.

[38] Z. Shen, S. Zhou and W. Shen, One-dimensional random attractor and rotation number of the stochastic damped sine-Gordon equation, *J. Differential Equations*, **248** (2010), 1432-1457.

[39] C. Sun, D. Cao and J. Duan, Non-autonomous dynamics of wave equations with nonlinear damping and critical nonlinearity, *Nonlinearity*, **19** (2006), 2645–2665.

[40] C. Sun, M. Yang and C. Zhong, Global attractors for the wave equation with nonlinear damping, *J. Differential Equation*, **227** (2006), 427-443.

[41] R. Temam, Infinite-Dimensional Dynamical Systems in Mechanics and Physics, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997.

[42] B. Wang, Attractors for reaction-diffusion equations in unbounded domains, *Physica D*, **128** (1999), 41-52.

[43] B. Wang, Asymptotic behavior of stochastic wave equations with critical exponents on $\mathbb{R}^3$, *Transactions of American Mathematical Society*, **363** (2011), 3639-3663.

[44] B. Wang, Random Attractors for the Stochastic Benjamin-Bona-Mahony Equation on Unbounded Domains, *J. Differential Equations*, **246** (2009), 2506-2537.

[45] B. Wang, Sufficient and necessary criteria for existence of pullback attractors for non-compact random dynamical systems, *J. Differential Equations*, **253** (2012),1544-1583.

[46] B. Wang, Random attractors for non-autonomous stochastic wave equations with multiplicative noise, *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems*, **34** (2014), 269-300.

[47] Y. Wang and J. Wang, Pullback attractors for multivalued non-compact random dynamical systems generated by reaction-diffusion equations on an unbounded domain, *J. Differential Equations*, **259** (2015), 728-776.

[48] Z. Wang, S. Zhou and A. Gu, Random attractors for a stochastic damped wave equation with multiplicative noise on unbounded domains, *Nonlinear Analysis, Real World Applications*, **12** (2011), 3468-3482.